VOL 2

MICROFILMED—1978

"Advent Christian Times" Press: W. A. C. P. Association,
Buchanan, Mich.

THE

Advent Christian Quarterly.

VOL. II.—JULY, 1870.—NO. I.

LOSS AND GAIN.

By A. A. Phelps, A. M.

What loss did Adam sustain in Eden? When will that loss be regained?[1]

The discussion of this double question involves a double task. I am not permitted to enter upon a pleasant theological exploring expedition, in whatever sea the gentle gales of thought might chance to waft me, but am required to turn my prow in opposite directions, and make what discoveries I can around the two poles of our chronological and moral world.

I propose that the Bible be our only chart, and the evolution of truth, rather than the establishment of any pet theory, be our only aim. With this agreement, let us direct our course to Eden.

Behold the enrapturing scene! What verdant lawns and flowery meads invite our willing feet! How bright the bosom of that crystal river, spreading perpetual beauty along its banks, and rolling its divided waters into distant regions! See the beautiful groves and luscious fruits; for "every tree that is pleasant to the sight and sweet to the taste" springs forth from that virgin soil. Balmy breezes float over the delightful spot. The climate is neither too hot nor too cold. The feathered songsters gladden our hearts with their gushing music. No tear was ever

[1] The writer was requested to prepare an essay upon the subject involved in these questions. The accompanying paper is in response to that request.

UMI

shed, no groan was ever uttered, in this fair Eden home. It was the abode of health, harmony, and happiness. The place was fitted up by hands divine, as a beautiful specimen of what the whole earth was designed to become, under the culturing hand of obedience and love.

Such a home is worthy of occupants of no inferior order. The demand is promptly met. Our eyes are ravished with the appearance of a lovely pair—the crowning work of creation—bearing the marks of a high intelligence, and evidently intended for a lofty mission and a glorious destiny. There they stand, the very picture of health, beauty, and innocence. Created in the image of God, and designed to exercise control over all the brute creation, they are placed upon a higher intellectual plane, and distinguished from all other animals by the possession of a moral element that makes them accountable beings. Their hearts are untainted by sin, and their brows unwrinkled by care. They bask in the radiance of a loving Father's face, for the Sovereign of the universe is their daily companion.

With such a constitution, and such surroundings, and such companionship, how could they be unhappy? If, as some believe, their bliss was not *perfect*, yet it was surely a nearer approach to it than has ever fallen to the lot of their progeny. The very activities assigned them were calculated to administer pleasure rather than pain. With a single exception they had unlimited range among the myriad luxuries of their happy home. That small restriction upon their liberties was designed to develop their virtue by exercise, until they should become fortified in their allegiance to God, that every restraint might be removed, and unconditional immortality become their blissful heritage. Under such circumstances, there was every reason why they should maintain their integrity and *live*; but still a possibility that they might abuse their moral agency and *die*.

The terrible crisis is reached. The interdicted fruit is eaten, and all is changed. The brightness of yesterday is turned to blackness to-day. Ruin has driven her plowshare through man's happy heritage, and a fearful blight is everywhere apparent. It was no trifling offense for dependent man to lift his puny arm in defiance of his Creator's authority. To ignore such inexcusable conduct would be to implicate the justice of the eternal throne. No! such disobedience could not be allowed to pass unrebuked of God. All nature stood amazed, and hung out her signals of

distress. Or, as the blind bard of England has sung the solemn story—

> "Earth felt the wound, and nature from her seat,
> Sighing, through all her works gave signs of wo
> That all was lost."

With this *general* picture of the sad disaster that hung the once delightful home of man in the drapery of mourning, let us now proceed to inquire more specifically: "*What loss did Adam sustain in Eden?*"

1. He lost the *favor of God.*

His rebellion involved personal volition, and worked the immediate forfeiture of the divine approval. The whole history of the case shows that God was intensely displeased with man's disobedience. No valid excuse could be framed for such culpability. In vain did the *man* try to shift the responsibility upon his partner's shoulders, or the *woman* to find a justification for her crime in the subtlety of the serpent. Ignorance he could not plead, for the instruction had been clear, and the warning earnest. No dire extremity drove him to the disobedient act, for the store-house of plenty stood open day and night, and his cup of blessing was continually full. What extenuating circumstance could he plead? His mouth was stopped; and he who so lately stood up in the boldness of conscious innocence is now covered with the blushes of shame, and cowers under the lashings of a guilty conscience. The smiles of his God are suddenly changed to angry frowns, and the sweet communion of former days is ended. The criminality of man is fully established, and the gleaming sword of justice is uplifted to strike the fatal blow.

2. He lost his *personal purity.*

There is an obvious distinction between innocence and purity. The former has respect to man's relations—the latter, to his inherent nature. God made man "upright," and pronounced him "very good." His moral nature was free from the taint of sin. Purity was sweetly stamped on his whole being. But from that exalted position he suddenly and strangely fell. His conscience was corrupted. His heart was defiled. The purity which once allied him to angels was replaced by that foul depravity which degraded him to the kindredship of devils. Behold him, now, with the crown of glory fallen, and the bright impress of truth and love so sadly effaced! A deadly virus has permeated his moral system, and his heart is henceforth the fountain of many

UMI

corrupting streams. Pride and anger and envy and jealousy and selfishness and rebellion are now the unholy occupants of that bosom which once glowed with the holy flame of love. His tastes are vitiated; his moral perceptions are blunted; his imagination is defiled; his judgment is perverted; and the whole current of thought, desire, and affection is contaminated by the ruinous touch of sin. It may be difficult to explain the *philosophy* of such a sudden degeneracy, but there is the sad *fact*, confirmed not only by the sacred record, but by the whole history of the fallen race.

3. He lost a *happy home.*

No sooner had man rendered himself unfit for his station, than a decree of exile was pronounced. So "the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken." (Gen. 3: 23.) We can easily imagine that he went with much reluctance. How could it be otherwise? Was there not everything in Eden to attract him? Could he turn his back upon all its loveliness without a struggling emotion? There was a wide contrast between a peaceful home within the precincts of Paradise, and a toilsome tarrying in the uncultivated regions beyond. To suppose that Adam could accept the new situation without turning a regretful look toward Eden's lovely bowers is to suppose that he lost not only his sanctity, but also his senses. No wonder the record assures us that "God *drove* out the man;" for no one would relinquish such a home without compulsion.

But even if the decree of exile had not been carried out, my proposition would remain essentially true; for the brightness of Eden was beginning to fade under the withering curse that soon rested so heavily upon all the earth. Thorns and thistles shortly marred the fair fields of Paradise, and howling beasts of prey were roaming over that once delightful spot. The winds moaned a solemn dirge over the scenes of departed bliss, and dark masses of clouds rolled angrily around the fading grandeur of the garden. Those lovely bowers were soon prostrated by destructive storms, or fell into ruinous decay under the corroding touch of time. So thoroughly did the work of devastation go on that even the *locality* of that primeval residence was at length buried out of human sight. It is therefore doubly true that Adam lost his happy home; for, first, the glory of Eden soon departed; and, second, had that glory remained, rebellious man was forever excluded.

4. He lost the *first dominion.*

God designed man to "have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." (Gen. 1: 26.) He was intended to occupy a lofty position at the head of mundane affairs, and sway a peaceful scepter over the whole animal creation. As God ruled over the armies of heaven, so unfallen man was to rule over the creatures of earth. Had he maintained his purity, he might have walked in royalty over the glorious earth, and every living creature would have done him homage. There would have been no venomous serpents—no destructive animals, thirsting for human blood. When man proved false to his God, the earth proved treacherous to man. Everything went down in a common ruin. The fish of the sea, the fowls of the air, and the beasts that roamed over the curse-burdened earth were either filled with fear or infuriated with passion. Many of them went forth with hideous yells and gnashing teeth, armed with the weapons of destruction; and man, though originally designed to be lord of the brute, has often fallen a victim to brutal rapacity. Even the partial dominion which man possesses over the animal creation is generally acquired and retained by the exercise of brute force.

Observe, too, how the very elements have disputed the authority of degenerate man. Earth and air and sea have often conspired to baffle his projects and destroy his life. But for the sad lapse in Eden there would have been no pelting storms or shivering thunder-bolts—no choking thorns or troublesome thistles—no sweeping floods or devouring fires—no destructive tornadoes or burning mountains—no yawning simooms or heaving earthquakes! But man sinned, and creation groans! The diadem fell from his princely brow, and he was reduced to the most humiliating dependence. Driven by circumstances and exposed to casualties, he was henceforth more a conquered victim than a conquering hero.

5. He lost his *life.*

The penalty for eating of the forbidden fruit was originally announced in these words: "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." (Gen. 2: 17.) Current theology has decided that the death here denounced is threefold: spiritual, physical, and eternal. Spiritual death is defined to be the loss of original righteousness; physical death, the separation of soul and body;

UMI

and eternal death, the conscious existence of man in eternal misery. To this I reply:

(1) The loss of personal purity and innocence, already described, may, with some propriety, be called a "spiritual death;" but I deny that this spiritual death was any part of the Adamic penalty. This moral degeneracy was inseparably connected with the *crime*—either involved in it, or flowing from it, as a natural necessity—but was *not* included in the distinctive penalty which was actually inflicted by a sin-avenging God. It was Adam's *crime* that he bartered the friendship of Heaven and plunged into a pool of moral pollution. For that crime he must die.

(2) The popular theory assumes that man has a dual nature, in a sense not warranted by Scripture. In the original account of man's creation, where it would be so reasonable to expect the simple facts to be delineated in unambiguous terms, there is not the least intimation of such complexity of constitution. "Man became a living soul."

(3) Can any one suppose that Adam understood the death penalty to mean eternal misery? And yet, if such a destiny had been even *possible* to fallen man, surely every attribute of God's character was pledged to unfold the terrible fact.

(4) To call eternal existence in misery "death," is an abuse of language. It is to mystify what God has made plain, and thus destroy all confidence in revealed truth. If God's words are so involved in mystery that we are obliged to interpret by contraries and guess our way to conclusions, who can have any interest to listen to those words at all? If man was inherently immortal, what had he to fear from any death-penalty that even the Almighty could hang over his head?

(5) That the Adamic penalty cannot fairly be construed into endless misery, is abundantly proved by the fact that God promptly drove rebellious man from the garden, "lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat, *and live forever.*" Had sinful man thus partaken, he would have become immortal in misery. But that life-giving tree was guarded by flaming cherubim, *that no such possibility might ever occur.* In this we see the hand of Love, and adore that divine wisdom which, at the very introduction of sin on earth, made provision for its final and eternal extinguishment.

I conclude, therefore, that the tide of evidence is in favor of

a literal interpretation of the penalty. But among those who stand on this common ground, we find the following diversity of views:

First, that while the death-sentence was judicially pronounced against Adam immediately after his transgression, there was an actual *reprieve* granted, so that the penalty was in no sense executed till the day of his death, at the age of 930 years.

Second, that Adam was *not* reprieved, but *judicially tried, condemned, and executed, according to the real intent of the expressed law bearing on the case.* This is the view I choose to take. Let us then proceed to a direct inquiry into the significance of the Adamic penalty.

(1) The most reasonable conclusion is that Adam, in his pristine state, was neither mortal nor immortal, but capable of becoming either, according to his compliance or non-compliance with specified conditions. He was placed on *probation;* not for happiness, for he already possessed it; not for moral purity, for that, too, was his birth-right legacy; but for *immortality.* If he was already *immortal,* there was nothing to be gained, in that direction, by obedience: if he was already *mortal,* there was nothing to be lost, in the same direction, by disobedience. He had power to choose between these opposite destinies. The very idea of probation implies a trial of one's fidelity. God had an eminent right to apply a simple test that should settle the question of man's perpetual fealty to himself. He did this by pointing out two conspicuous trees—the one permitted, the other prohibited. Had man eaten of the "tree of life," while in a sinless state, his probation would have terminated, and a glorious immortality ensued. Unfortunately, though not by mistake, he partook of the wrong tree. His probation instantly closed, and mortality was his portion.

(2) The foregoing view is quite in harmony with the real sense of the passage: "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The more literal rendering of the Hebrew is, "Dying thou shalt die." The Arabic renders it, "Thou shalt deserve to die." The Targum of Jonathan, "Thou shalt be subject to death." The Greek of Symmachus, and also the Syriac—as approved by Jerome, Grotius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Ambrose, and many others—agree in rendering it, "Thou shalt be mortal." Dr. Adam Clarke paraphrases it thus: "From that moment thou shalt become mortal, and continue in a dying state

UMI

till thou die." I have no doubt that this is the real force of the language employed. Adam sinned, was arrested, examined, and condemned. Immediately the threatened penalty began to operate, and the process continued till the suffering, dying man was dead.

(3) It is always safe to let God explain his own plans and propositions.

"God is his own interpreter,
And he will make it plain."

The comprehensive penal threat—"dying thou shalt die"—is fully elucidated in the third chapter of Genesis. "Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children." "And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.

Can we suppose that God would inflict upon man a double penalty for a given crime? If not, then the cup of sorrow which apostate Adam was compelled to drink, through all the dreary years of his natural life, was a part of the penalty originally denounced. Sin reduced him to the necessity of earning his bread by sweat and toil; being encompassed with difficulty, surrounded with danger, afflicted with disease, and exposed to death. By such weakening and wearing processes did the sorrowing head of our race gradually return to the dust whence he was taken.

(4) As the "death" inflicted upon Adam in *this* world was for his *personal transgression*, and as the "death" to be inflicted upon every impenitent sinner in the *next* world will be for *his* personal transgression, we have a right to look for a striking analogy between the respective death-penalties. What, then, are the facts in relation to the sinner's doom? When the story is to be told in a single sentence, we read that "the wages of sin is death." Multitudes of Scripture testimonies gladden our hearts with the assurance that extermination is the final destiny of the devil and all his persistent followers. But in saying this

have we uttered the whole truth? Are there not scenes of suffering vividly depicted as a portion of the sinner's doom? What are we to understand by the "weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth," or by the "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish," so solemnly coupled with the destiny of the wicked? Surely this pelting of the wrathful storm, no less than the utter destruction that follows, comes legitimately to the sinner as a part of his well-earned wages; and it is no gain to the cause of truth to keep *this* part of "damnation snugly out of sight."

(5) In confirmation of all that has been offered under this head, I refer you to the sufferings of the Son of God. "He was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." See how that grief ripened into bitter anguish and bloody sweat, in Gethsemane's gloomy garden. Follow him to Calvary. Hear his agonizing cry. He died forsaken of God. Why this intense sorrow? Was it a superfluous demonstration? Surely this agony was not for himself, but for us. Unless the sinner deserved such anguish, there was no need of Christ's drinking so bitter a cup. The blessed Jesus bowed his head, and received the penal blows which the law must otherwise inflict on rebel man. He who accepts this glorious substitute escapes the wrath to come; but he who rejects it, must bare his own bosom to the stroke, and die, at length, amid the wailings of despair. Let those who claim that the sorrow connected with the sinner's destruction is wholly incidental, forming no part of the penalty of sin, explain, if they can, the philosophy of that keen anguish which pressed so heavily upon a Savior's innocent heart.

It is now time to consider another aspect of this important subject. We have seen the sad rebellion that broke out in Eden, and watched the withering curse that followed. Bitter, indeed, was the cup that was pressed to Adam's polluted lips. Long and tedious was that night of sorrow which eventuated in literal death. Such was the loss sustained by breaking away from his allegiance to God.

WHEN WILL THAT LOSS BE REGAINED?

So far as *Adam* is concerned, I think the loss is irrecoverable. Had he received a pardon, he would have escaped the penalty; for we cannot conceive how he could consistently have received

both. It is not like the administration of God to pardon and then punish the same offense. But where is the least intimation in the Scriptures that Adam was ever restored, or will ever be saved? His name never occurs in the catalogue of patriarchs, prophets, or saints.

I see no hope of any future life for Adam, because there was no provision made to reach his case. If you refer to the remarkable prediction that was uttered concerning the seed of the woman, I beg you to notice that this first ray of hope that rested upon a ruined world came, not in the form of a promise to Adam, but of a significant threat to the serpent. It was the shout of a conqueror in advance of the mighty struggle which was sure to end in complete and everlasting triumph.

But how does Adam's *posterity* stand related to this question of loss and gain? It has been argued by some that whatever evils accrue to the race in consequence of Adam's fall, will be unconditionally removed by Christ. I think this position is hardly tenable. Some care must be exercised lest we transcend our own limits, in prescribing limits for the Almighty. The divine laws of compensation are truly wonderful in the extent of their range and the beneficence of their operation; but that the loss sustained by Adam will, in kind, be exactly and unconditionally made up to his progeny, admits of a serious doubt. Ample provisions have been made by which *much* of Adam's loss will be unconditionally restored to the propagated race, and *more* than Adam's loss may be conditionally gained by all who will accept of the great salvation.

1. Our natural life, or temporal existence, is one result of the remedial scheme. Adam had turned his freedom to bad account, and Satan was chuckling with hellish glee over the spoils he had won. But God was not to be thus defeated. His resources of wisdom and power and love were adequate to the terrible emergency, and the wonderful system of recovering mercy was devised for the unborn and uncounted millions of Adam's progeny. Indeed, there would have been no such *progeny*, had there been no such gracious *provision*. The commission to multiply and replenish the earth was given to Adam when in a sinless state, and called for a generation of sinless beings. The sad lapse in Eden occurred before a single soul was born. This vitiated the whole contract, and Adam had no rights, except to die. We were all dead in the sense of being *non-existent*, the very hour

Adam forfeited his right to live, and lost his power to propagate a holy race. But for the intervention of divine mercy, our federal head would have lingered out his days in solitude, and died without offspring. God would not—*could* not bring into the world a race of intelligent beings, who, without any choice in their creation, must groan and die under the burden of a superimposed and remediless curse. Had the multiplication of the human species been entirely forestalled, no principle of right would have been violated; for we obviously had no rights antecedent to our existence. But who will deny that sentient, accountable *beings* have a claim upon their great Originator for instituting such measures as shall conduce to their *well*-being, and thus render life a blessing rather than a curse? God really seemed to be shut up to this alternative: either to let apostate Adam die without issue, or to make gracious provisions for the propagated race. He chose the latter. "Mercy and truth met together," and agreed on the terms upon which a mortal race might be generated. The conclusion is thus reached, the natural life of Adam's progeny is the purchase of a *Savior*, "slain from the foundation of the world."

But is such temporal existence to be reckoned a *blessing*? Undoubtedly it is. The very tenacity with which humanity clings to life, even though that life be embittered with sighs and tears, is an affirmative verdict. Theorists may argue, from the prevalence of human sorrow, that life is to be endured as a burden, rather than accepted as a benefaction; but if we appeal to facts—to individual consciousness and preferences—we find that the *argumentum ad hominem* abundantly refutes all such dark-shaded philosphy. Personal existence is therefore to be accepted as a positive gain—a divine gratuity—the purchase of redeeming love.

2. But the unconditional benefaction extended further. God decided that as Adam had lost his probation and his life, his descendants should have both restored. Their natural life should constitute a probation for eternal life.

But a formidable difficulty confronts us. Springing from a diseased and dying stock, we, too, are necessarily mortal. Our connection with Adam soon lands us in the gloomy abode of corruption and worms. "As through one man sin entered into the world (in whom all sinned), and through sin, death; so, also, death passed upon all men." (Rom. 5: 12. *Emphatic Diaglott.*)

Our progenitor was trembling and dying under the curse of violated law. In a passive sense all his offspring are accounted sinners, and must suffer the death which comes by inheritance as a common calamity to the race. Thus our existence—though a positive blessing in itself—is necessarily circumscribed within narrow limits, unless by some means this deep, dark, death-chasm, which Adam's degeneracy has thrown across our pathway, can be successfully spanned. Of necessity, there can be *no future life*, and hence no *probation* for a future and eternal life, unless the race can be lifted over the valley of death. A *resurrection* is therefore necessary to open the portals of immortality, and enable man to become a party in the contract for this priceless boon. Thank God, the difficulty has been surmounted! The curse lay heavily upon us, but "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." (Gal. 3: 13.) This elevates humanity from the condition of prisoners doomed to destruction, to that of privileged subjects, accountable to their great Redeemer for their probationary career. Hence, "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust," "for we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ." (Acts 24: 15; 2 Cor. 5: 10.) Yes, the archangel's bellowing trump shall rend the tombs and vaults of the dead, and reanimated millions shall suddenly vacate their dusty beds; for "all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." (John 5: 28, 29.) All that go down to the grave without their fault, shall be lifted out of it without their volition; for "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." (1 Cor. 15: 22.)

3. We are now prepared to look more fully at man's moral relations. We have seen how the divine law of compensation practically nullifies the law of death, by giving the race an unconditional resurrection. This glorious result is accomplished by the voluntary death of "the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." By the same act of redeeming love we are freed from all *moral responsibilty* growing out of Adam's transgression. "As by the offense of one [Adam] judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one [Christ] the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience [the] many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall [the] many be made righteous." (Rom. 5: 18, 19.) The ransomed race now owes its life and services to Jesus Christ, the great Redeemer. He becomes at once the "Savior of all men" from the original law of sin and death, and the "Author of eternal salvation unto *all them that obey him.*" Though we are

> "Sprung from the man whose guilty fall
> Corrupts his race and taints us all;"

yet no dark record will stare us in the face at the judgment, in consequence of Adam's defection. No one will be able to urge in extenuation of his personal guilt that "the fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children's teeth are set on edge; but every one shall die for his own iniquity; *every man* that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge." (Jer. 31: 29, 30.)

As Adam's progeny was thus prospectively redeemed from the curse of the law, so their names were prospectively entered upon the "Lamb's book of life." If they are true to the claims of Christ, their names will never be "blotted out." And just here we find a key to the glorious truth that those dying in infancy will be among the gathered "jewels" in the world's great harvest.

But, though the children are not responsible for their father's sins, they are evidently answerable for their own. With the taint of natural depravity, and the temptations of a deceitful devil, there is a terrible tendency among men to run into actual sin. As a resultant fact, the "world lieth in wickedness." And since those who trample upon the authority of Jesus Christ must answer it before his awful tribunal, and be rewarded with the "second death," it follows that actual transgressors must inevitably perish, unless a positive provision for *pardon* is made for the guilty. What reason we have for gratitude, that even this demand is met by the matchless mercy of God!

> "There is a fountain filled with blood,
> Drawn from Immanuel's veins;
> And sinner's plunged beneath that flood,
> Lose all their guilty stains."

It might be difficult to conceive how God could pardon the sinner arbitrarily, but since Calvary streamed with the blood of its spotless victim, we can see how God can be "just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." The "one offense" of

UMI

Adam brought swift condemnation, but the "many offences" of his ransomed progeny are freely cancelled by the all-forgiving Christ. Though our "sins be as scarlet," they may be "as white as snow;" for the gushing blood of the Crucified shall never lose its efficacy,

> "Till all the ransomed church of God
> Are saved, to sin no more."

I do not say that pardon comes unsought; much less that it is forced upon those whose every act is a practical rejection of him who possesses the pardoning power. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper, but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy." (Prov. 28: 13.) It is in penitency and prayer that faith gathers up its strength and lays hold on Jesus, "mighty to save!" "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. 10: 10.) "If we confess our sins, he [Christ] is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John 1: 9.) Thus we see that a free pardon for all the past, and a full deliverance from the power of present sin, are the blissful heritage of the penitent soul who ventures all upon the atoning blood.

While, however, the pardon of personal sin is strictly conditional, there are many gracious helps that come, unsought, to the needy and imperiled race. If we are placed under circumstances of special trial, in consequence of Adam's fall, let us not forget the special influences that gather about us—unmerited and unasked—to lift us over the difficulty, and lead us back to God. The solemn warnings, sweet invitations, earnest entreaties, precious promises, and supernatural inspirations, so freely scattered along our pathway, are but so many distinct whispers of mercy—so many impressive proofs of God's willingness to save.

Nowhere does the loveliness of God's character shine forth so illustriously as in the development of that scheme which honors the claims of justice, and yet dispenses pardon to the repentant sinner. How precious the privilege of becoming vitally connected with Christ, and having the positive assurance of the Holy Spirit that we are even now the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty! I am sure the sweets of redeeming love overbalance the sorrows that gather about our pilgrim feet, and lay us under special obligations to sing the glories of our Savior's matchless name.

4. We have now advanced far enough in the discussion to see some of the opening glories of God's great plan of human redemption. Millions of intelligent beings are brought into existence. That existence is made a proper probation for a future and unending life. Redemption from the Adamic death is guaranteed to the race without any conditions. Salvation from personal sin, and exemption from the second death—the legitimate wages of personal sin—are offered to all who will accept of Jesus as their righteousness and their life. Thus we see that our loss in Adam is partially repaired while we yet linger on the shores of mortality; but another world will be necessary to complete the picture and consummate our bliss. A glorious "restitution" is to succeed this arena of strife and storm, of bickering and bloodshed, of disease and death. It is good to have a few stray beams of God's own sweet sunshine, in a world so darkened by sin; but what will it be to bask in the full blaze of God's unmingled glory in that "new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness?" It is good to be "sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession;" but how much better to be safely colonized on that immortal shore, where hope shall be "changed to glad fruition, faith to sight, and prayer to praise!" That blissful consummation will surely come. It is not when our feet kiss the cold waters of death that we are borne away to some "spirit-land;" but "when Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory." With uplifted eyes and throbbing hearts we are watching even now for the blessed Bridegroom to ride down the blazing heavens, and press the weeping, waiting bride to his bosom of love. Scenes of grandeur and songs of gladness will crown the royal nuptials. Already, by faith, I see the glitter of diadems and hear the rustling of white robes.

* * * * * * * * *

The coronation day has come! The fiery baptism has done its destined work; the last vestige of the curse is removed. The fearful havoc of sin is over, at last! The devil and all his works are destroyed. A new earth has emerged from the blazing chaos, and lo! it blooms with more than Eden beauty. The "New Jerusalem" is there, with its gates of pearl and streets of gold. Its jasper walls resound with the matchless melody of ransomed millions, as they "return to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy

UMI

upon their heads." The long, dark night of weeping is past. The soft hand of love has wiped away the last tear, and every heart is dancing with holy delight.

"No chilling wind or pois'nous breath
Can reach that healthful shore;
Sickness and sorrow, pain and death,
Are felt and feared no more."

Paradise is fully restored. The original pattern is greatly enlarged and improved, for *the whole earth* is full of God's glory. The ruin of Adam is more than repaired in the redemption of Jesus.

The saints of all ages are gathered into their holy, happy home. They have exchanged the tents of poverty for the palaces of princes. They drink from crystal fountains, and eat the delicious fruit of Life's fair tree. No cheeks are furrowed with care—no locks are whitened with age. Each glorified countenance blooms with immortal freshness and beauty. Myriads of shining angels, sweeping in radiant defiles from their former abodes of blessedness, have come down to mingle with the blood-washed millions of earth in swelling the high praises of our immortal King!

"Worthy the Lamb, the angels cry,
To be exalted thus;
Worthy the Lamb, our hearts reply,
For he was slain for us!"

"If God reveal anything to you by any other instrument of his, be as ready to receive it as ever you were to receive any truth by my ministry; for I am verily persuaded—I am very confident—*the Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word.* For my part I cannot sufficiently bewail the condition of the Reformed Churches, who are come to a period in religion, and will go at present no further than the instruments of the first reformation. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; whatever part of his will our good God has imparted and revealed unto Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it. And the Calvinists, you see, stick fast where they were left by that great man of God. This is a misery much to be lamented."—*Robinson's last Charge to the Pilgrim Fathers.*

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith."—*Sixth Article of the Church of England Creed.*

THE RESTITUTION.

By Eld. O. R. Fassett, Minneapolis, Minn.

"Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind." (Is. 65: 17.)

"At the present we see the world in its working-clothes; but hereafter it will be arrayed in its white Sunday robes. God will make not the earth only, but the heaven also, much more beautiful than they are at present."—*Luther.*

"None ever saw this world as it was in its first creation but Adam and his wife, neither will any one see it until the manifestation of the children of God; that is, until the redemption or resurrection of the saints. But then it shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God."—*John Bunyan.*

"All the earth will be a more beautiful paradise than Adam ever saw."—*John Wesley.*

"Thus heavenward all things tend, for all were once perfect, and all must be at length restored."—*Cowper.*

Man was driven from "Paradise" for disobedience; and ever since he bade adieu in sorrow to the lovely and luxuriant bowers of "the Garden of Eden," to "till the ground from whence he was taken," "cursed" for his transgression, he has been a hopeless wanderer, in the vain pursuit of a new and "better country"—a more desirable home—with happiness and bliss unsullied by sorrow, suffering, affliction, toil, and care, and where health and length of days could be secured and enjoyed, and the fruits of the curse be mitigated, or no more experienced. These have been, from the earliest ages, the incentives to migratory movements of the human family, and have given enterprise and spirit to removals for "permanent residence"—or "a residence of some continuance." Cain, "cursed from the earth," "a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth," "went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden;" and there he "builded a city;" and he and his descendants were the first artisans, the first musicians, the first polygamists, and the first murderers of our fallen race. (Gen. 4.)

In the antediluvian age, the race and posterity of Adam spread abroad upon "the face of the earth;" and in that remote antiquity the longevity of man was very great, so that by the great multiplication of its inhabitants, the globe became peopled by the human family, who had dispersed abroad to find homes for themselves and their posterity. When, therefore, the inhabitants became "corrupt" and "wicked exceedingly," so as to provoke God to destroy them from the earth by the waters of a flood, it was necessary to submerge the entire globe: "and the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high

hills that were under the whole heaven were covered, and the mountains were covered. And all flesh died that moved upon the earth." (Gen. 7 : 19–23.)

POSTDILUVIAN MIGRATION.

Immediately subsequent to the deluge, the family of Noah and their descendants "journeyed from the East, and found a plain in the valley of Shinar." This was a rich and fertile valley in ancient Assyria, enriched by the confluent waters of these two beautiful rivers, the Euphrates and Tigris. Here they commenced the building of an immense "tower," whose summit, they intended, "should reach unto heaven;" and which did attain the hight of six hundred feet from its base before God suspended the work; he seeing that nothing would remain unattempted in their unrestrained impiety. And they, too, began the building of these two unrivaled cities, Babylon and Nineveh —which in process of time became so surpassingly magnificent and opulent. These, together with the "tower," were to be the centers of hope and of safety in the case of any future catastrophe, like that of the flood, or any other unforseen calamity which might serve to disperse them: "lest," say they, "we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth."

But a new affliction found them entirely unprepared, and brought upon them what they feared. "God confounded their language, that they might not understand each other's speech." And the result was, "they were scattered abroad from thence upon the face of the whole earth."

FIRST MIGRATORY MOVEMENTS AFTER THE CONFUSION OF TONGUES.

Disrupted, severed, and broken, the human family were scattered in clans all abroad, which went on exploring expeditions to find suitable locations in genial climes for desirable homes and resting-places. It was in this remote period of our world's history that the ancient empires of China and Japan were founded, in the discovered countries far to the eastward, which have continued through the ages to this day.

Other migratory bands journeyed to the westward and southward, and found that wonderful and mysterious river, the Nile, whose immense and extended valley was annually fertilized by its swollen and overflowing waters during the rainy seasons in the mountains far to the south, in Nubia and Abyssinia. Here in

this fertile valley, which was afterwards destined to be "the granary of the world," were builded those grand and magnificent cities of ancient time, Karnac, Luxor, Memphis, and Thebes with its "hundred gates." And the people of that age have left us the lasting monuments of their great power, knowledge, skill in sculpture and architecture; and the vast Pyramids reaching heavenward, and standing in silent grandeur amid the ruins of the ages to this day, are the relics of the former greatness of an ancient race of men.

DEPOPULATION AND RUIN OF THE ANCIENT COUNTRIES AND CITIES.

Oppression, tyranny, despotism, and extortion under the reign of despotic monarchs crushed out the hopes of the people, and gave rise to internecine troubles and wars; and caused also an exodus from those ancient lands and cities. Foreign invasions, too, under ambitious and covetous conquerors and kings, who became their "cruel lords," despoiled and depopulated their cities and countries; and Egypt, once so populous and prosperous, and her kingdom "the wisest of nations," has become, indeed, in the striking language of prophecy, "the basest of kingdoms." Both Assyria and Egypt were brought to ruin and desolation by the curse of oppression and war, and the judgments of the Most High for their wickedness; and while their ancient cities lie buried in graves, or in the wildest confusion, and their empires have passed away forever, "the Star of Empire westward takes its way."

THE NORTHWESTERN SETTLEMENTS.

The continent of Europe to the west and north became peopled in process of time by various families and tribes of men journeying from the east and south. These lived in families, or independent communities, and often in the rudest and most uncultivated manner for a considerable period. Subsequently the Græco-Macedonian kingdom gained the dominion; and afterward the Roman kingdom encircled the earth in its iron sway.

Rome, with all its munificence and benevolence to submissive and conquered tribes and nations, nevertheless became the dread of the world, while as "the mistress of nations" she "trod down the whole earth" under her unconquerable and despotic power.

Ultimately, barbaric hordes from the north of Europe came down upon Rome and the capital of the Western Empire, and

UMI

hills that were under the whole heaven were covered, and the mountains were covered. And all flesh died that moved upon the earth." (Gen. 7 : 19–23.)

POSTDILUVIAN MIGRATION.

Immediately subsequent to the deluge, the family of Noah and their descendants "journeyed from the East, and found a plain in the valley of Shinar." This was a rich and fertile valley in ancient Assyria, enriched by the confluent waters of these two beautiful rivers, the Euphrates and Tigris. Here they commenced the building of an immense "tower," whose summit, they intended, "should reach unto heaven;" and which did attain the hight of six hundred feet from its base before God suspended the work; he seeing that nothing would remain unattempted in their unrestrained impiety. And they, too, began the building of these two unrivaled cities, Babylon and Nineveh —which in process of time became so surpassingly magnificent and opulent. These, together with the "tower," were to be the centers of hope and of safety in the case of any future catastrophe, like that of the flood, or any other unforseen calamity which might serve to disperse them: "lest," say they, "we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth."

But a new affliction found them entirely unprepared, and brought upon them what they feared. "God confounded their language, that they might not understand each other's speech." And the result was, "they were scattered abroad from thence upon the face of the whole earth."

FIRST MIGRATORY MOVEMENTS AFTER THE CONFUSION OF TONGUES.

Disrupted, severed, and broken, the human family were scattered in clans all abroad, which went on exploring expeditions to find suitable locations in genial climes for desirable homes and resting-places. It was in this remote period of our world's history that the ancient empires of China and Japan were founded, in the discovered countries far to the eastward, which have continued through the ages to this day.

Other migratory bands journeyed to the westward and southward, and found that wonderful and mysterious river, the Nile, whose immense and extended valley was annually fertilized by its swollen and overflowing waters during the rainy seasons in the mountains far to the south, in Nubia and Abyssinia. Here in

this fertile valley, which was afterwards destined to be "the granary of the world," were builded those grand and magnificent cities of ancient time, Karnac, Luxor, Memphis, and Thebes with its "hundred gates." And the people of that age have left us the lasting monuments of their great power, knowledge, skill in sculpture and architecture; and the vast Pyramids reaching heavenward, and standing in silent grandeur amid the ruins of the ages to this day, are the relics of the former greatness of an ancient race of men.

DEPOPULATION AND RUIN OF THE ANCIENT COUNTRIES AND CITIES.

Oppression, tyranny, despotism, and extortion under the reign of despotic monarchs crushed out the hopes of the people, and gave rise to internecine troubles and wars; and caused also an exodus from those ancient lands and cities. Foreign invasions, too, under ambitious and covetous conquerors and kings, who became their "cruel lords," despoiled and depopulated their cities and countries; and Egypt, once so populous and prosperous, and her kingdom "the wisest of nations," has become, indeed, in the striking language of prophecy, "the basest of kingdoms." Both Assyria and Egypt were brought to ruin and desolation by the curse of oppression and war, and the judgments of the Most High for their wickedness; and while their ancient cities lie buried in graves, or in the wildest confusion, and their empires have passed away forever, "the Star of Empire westward takes its way."

THE NORTHWESTERN SETTLEMENTS.

The continent of Europe to the west and north became peopled in process of time by various families and tribes of men journeying from the east and south. These lived in families, or independent communities, and often in the rudest and most uncultivated manner for a considerable period. Subsequently the Græco-Macedonian kingdom gained the dominion; and afterward the Roman kingdom encircled the earth in its iron sway.

Rome, with all its munificence and benevolence to submissive and conquered tribes and nations, nevertheless became the dread of the world, while as "the mistress of nations" she "trod down the whole earth" under her unconquerable and despotic power.

Ultimately, barbaric hordes from the north of Europe came down upon Rome and the capital of the Western Empire, and

UMI

broke and disrupted the western divisions into fragmentary kingdoms; and afterwards, in this "wilderness" of the empire, the bishops, or popes of Rome, gained accession to, and sat enthroned in the seat of the Cæsars. The Eastern Empire, with its capitol at Constantinople, also overthrown, fell into the possession and under the dominion of the Caliphs, or successors of Mohammed. Then it was that despotism, tyranny, and violence reigned supreme; and both civil and religious liberty, with intelligence, was driven out of the world; and the "Dark Ages" suspervened.

A NEW CONTINENT DISCOVERED.

Hope inspires the human breast; and another and "better country" is faintly imagined to lie beyond the untraversed ocean, where the iron heel of oppression and despotism could not trample on the rights of men—which might afford an asylum for the oppressed, and whose virgin soil would yield an abundance to requit the labor and toil of the husbandman. A few adventurous spirits became the exponents of this hope, among whom was Christopher Columbus, who, after many discouragements, attained a suitable outfit for an extended and venturesome voyage, and started on his perilous and hazardous journey upon an unbounded and trackless deep. After having traversed the ocean far out of sight of his native land, and the shores of the "old world," braving the dangers of the untried sea, a mutiny on board his vessel of a serious nature endangered his own life, and nearly proved fatal to the expedition; but with a bold heart, and faith in the ultimate success of his voyage, he quelled the mutiny, and finally, to the joy of all, a new land was discovered. And soon an unexplored and vast continent, exceeding the highest pictures of the imagination, was revealed to the astonished world of mankind.

Emigration at once set in toward this far western world, and has continued to this day in an ever-increasing tide. The oppressed peoples of the "old world" came here to form a government of freedom and justice in these native wilds, and under the dominion of which the "inalienable rights" of men should be respected. The afflicted, harrassed, and persecuted church came to take refuge under a rule of righteous toleration; and families and individuals, to find themselves homes sheltered from oppressive tyranny, and visited by domestic tranquility and prosperity. And here has been enjoyed—thank God!—both civil and religious rights and privileges, together with domestic and social happiness and bliss, above that enjoyed in any age or country in the world since the fall. Here has been discovered a vast and fertile country, abounding with extensive forests, magnificent prairies, mountains, hills, and valleys; and these interspersed with most beautiful silvery lakes, great and small; majestic rivers, delightful streams, and purling brooks; and every variety of romantic and enchanting scenery that eye has ever witnessed. What an inheritance has fallen into the lap of man in these last days! And should it not call forth the highest gratitude from our hearts, who are permitted to enjoy it, to the bountiful Giver of all good? And yet this is not our "rest: it is polluted" by "sin" and the "curse;" and hence the universal

DISSATISFACTION AND UNREST.

With all this vast and beautiful domain, added to the inheritance of man in these "last days," mankind are still unsatisfied, and more and more at unrest. Two things are most apparent to every observing mind:

1. Mankind cannot be satisfied with this present world; and
2. There is implanted in every human heart a desire for a better.

Wherever we go, and whoever we see, and however fortunate, favorable, and happy may be the circumstances and the surroundings in which we may find individuals and families, even though they may "have more than heart can wish," yet they are unsatisfied, and would have something better. A change is desirable, and even longed for. A better country—a happier home—a more congenial and healthful climate, where longevity can be insured—a better government, executing justice and securing civil rights more perfectly—a happier, nobler, and choicer citizenship, with better social advantages in the society of kindred and loving spirits—these, with innumerable other things, are ardently desired and longed for.

It is this which has called out the inventive genius and intelligence of the age in the marvelous practical results attained for the benefit and advantages of the race. In the means and facilities of locomotion, we have the majestic steamship, the pride of the ocean, the sea, lakes, and rivers, by which we are rapidly navigated; and the railroad, with its wondrous fiery chariots,

UMI

accommodation, and palace cars, which "give us wings" to fly over the land, annihilating space and "magnificent distances." The means of transit and facilities for travel have been improved and multiplied a hundred-fold above that of any other age in the whole history of man. Also those of transmitting intelligence and gaining knowledge. We have the printing-press; and the magnetic telegraph, with lines extended over continents, and the ocean cables. And there are amazing improvements in agricultural implements, and a vast increase of knowledge in husbandry, by which the earth is subdued, its different soils brought under cultivation, and made to produce more abundant harvests, and these reaped and gathered into barns. So also are there marvels wrought in all branches of the arts and manufactures.

Besides, the revelation of God, in the Bible, is now, for the first time, given the world without "a veil," its "seals" broken, its mysteries disclosed, and as a "book open," in the vernacular tongue of all peoples, so that the nations can read from an "open Bible" in their own language "the wonderful works of God." (2 Cor. 3: 14; Rev. 5, 6, and 10.) Without fear of contradiction, we are actually living in that important epoch, "the time of the end," when "knowledge shall be increased." (Dan. 12: 4, 9, 10.)

INCREASED EMIGRATION.

Emigration from the facilities at hand has become astounding! It is on a magnificent scale unprecedented in the annals of history! The whole world of mankind seem to be moving! Stand on the sea-board of the Atlantic or the Pacific and witness the arrival of "steamers" with their living freights of human beings! Stand at the great centers of commerce and trade; and at the great thoroughfares and convergence of railroads, and see the immense, constant, moving multitudes of men coming and going! How the tide of humanity is ebbing and flowing! For the first time in the history of our world we are having the fulfillment of the scriptures: "Many shall run to and fro" (Dan. 12: 4): for it is certainly unparalleled. "Wo to multitudes of many people, which make a noise like the noise of seas: and to the rushing of nations, that make a rushing like the rushing of mighty waters! The nations shall rush like the rushing of many waters; but God shall rebuke them, and they shall flee far off,

and shall be chased as the chaff of the mountains before the wind, and like a rolling thing before the whirlwind;" and this will be "at evening tide," when there is to be "trouble;" and before "the morning" of an endless day. (Is. 18: 12-14; Dan. 12: 1, 3; 2: 34, 35, 44.) Why is the whole world moving? They are unsatisfied with their condition; they are at unrest. "The race is homesick!"

To fill this ever-increasing, ardent, and anxious desire, our Heavenly Father has given a promise which should fall on our ears, and enter into our hearts, producing the most joyful, cheerful, and enrapturing consolation and hope. It is this: "Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind." And until this promise is realised, the world of mankind will become more and more restless and homesick. And so God designs that men may hope in his word of promise only.

THE PRESENT EARTH DOOMED TO DESTRUCTION.

God, "in the beginning," created this heavens and earth beautiful and good. (Gen. 1: 31.) But in consequence of the introduction of sin they have been subjected to the "curse." (Gen. 3.) And "the curse hath devoured the earth, and they that dwell therein are desolate." (Is. 24: 6.) They have "waxed old like a garment" (Is. 51: 6); and concerning them there is hope only in their regenesis; for "they are reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." (2 Pet. 3: 7.) "That which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned." (Heb. 6: 8.) The world may fancy that under human ingenuity, skill, and science, and by human enterprise, moral, social, and religious reforms, this earth may yet become an Eden, and be redeemed from under the curse pronounced upon it: but every year will only add to their disappointment and the vanity of their hope. This earth, with its surrounding atmosphere, is doomed to fire and flames. "The heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up." (2 Pet. 3.)

Unless, therefore, the Lord perform his promise, there is no hope for the race. This he will do. Hence, says Peter, "we according to his promise look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." (2 Pet. 3.) And not until after

UMI

the final conflagration at "the day of judgment" can we look for the new creation. Dr. Adam Clarke, in his comments on 2 Pet. 3, says: "The present earth, though destined to be burned up, will not be destroyed, but renewed, and refined, and purged from all moral and material imperfection, and made the endless abode of happy spirits. But this state is certainly to be expected *after the day of judgment.*" And again: "All decomposed; but none of them destroyed; and as they are the original matter out of which God formed the terraqueous globe, consequently they may enter again into the composition of the new earth."

As this earth once survived the deluge of water, so will it again survive a second deluge, even of fire, and come forth in more than pristine beauty, "as the Phœnix rises from the ashes of its fire, animated with new life." Says Dr. Dick: "As the world was formerly destroyed by a deluge of waters, in consequence of the depravity of man, so its destruction by fire will take place for the same reason, in order that it may be purified from all the effects of the curse, which was originally pronounced upon the ground for man's sake, and restored to its former order and beauty. This appears to be the sense in which the most judicious expositors of the Scriptures interpret those passages which have a particular reference to this event. We are assured that after the resurrection, a *material world* will be prepared for the habitation of the just, in which their connection with the visible universe will doubtless be far more extensive than it is at present. This new world will exhibit scenes of beauty and grandeur of exquisite contrivance and benevolent design. For if the world we now inhabit, amidst all the deformities and physical derangements which sin has introduced, displays so many beautiful arrangements and marks of intelligence and skill, much more we conclude that the world in which 'righteousness shall dwell' (2 Pet. 3) will abound with everything that can charm the eye, the ear, or the imagination, and will illustrate the manifold wisdom of God."

This "new heavens and earth" will meet all the desires of the human heart. It will be a world with "no more curse" (Rev. 22: 3), constituting "a better country; that is, a heavenly" (Heb. 11: 6), containing "mansions" of magnificent and surpassing beauty and grandeur. (John 14: 1–3; Gal. 4: 26; Rev. 3: 12; 21.) Possessing a healthful climate, and pure and balmy

atmosphere, insuring health and longevity, even life for evermore, "the inhabitant shall not say, I am sick" (Is. 33: 21); and all are immortal: for "mortality" is "swallowed up of life" (2 Cor. 5: 4), and "death is swallowed up in victory." (Is 25: 8; 1 Cor. 15: 51–57.)

The society will be most congenial and perfect, being "all righteous" (Is. 60: 21, 22); the government and laws such as are adapted to such a world, and needing no change for the better—founded and established and administered in truth and righteousness: for the kingdom is the Lord's; and is "everlasting." (Is. 33: 20–25; 60: 18–22; Dan. 2: 44; 7: 14; Heb. 12: 28.)

THE TIME.

The time for the promised restitution is evidently nigh at hand.

1. The cycle of six thousand years has quite completed its circuit, and the seventh thousand is about to be ushered in.

> "The promised rest, the promised Sabbath comes;
> Six thousand years of sorrow have well nigh
> Fulfilled their tardy and disastrous course
> Over a sinful world; and what remains
> Of this tempestuous state of human things
> Is merely as the working of a sea
> Before a calm, that rocks itself to rest."[1]

2. The prophetic history of this world is nearly completed, as symbolized in the consecutive and chronological prophecies in the word of God. As said Philip Melancthon: "God showed to Daniel a series of monarchies and kingdoms which it is certain have already run to an end. Four monarchies have passed away—soon will dawn the day in which the dead shall be recalled to life."

It is most apparent to every student of prophecy that since the disruption of the Roman empire, which has many centuries since taken place, and since the Popedom has arisen and fulfilled its history of over a thousand years of tyranny and despotism over both the church and the kingdoms of the world, that the everlasting kingdom of God must be near. And the "sanctuary" "trodden under foot" must "be cleansed." (Dan. 8.) Not simply "the border of his sanctuary" (Ps. 88: 54); but the whole "sanctuary" which has been, and still is "trodden under foot" by the governments of this world. (Dan. 7: 17, 18; 8: 1–

[1] *The Task.*

UMI

14.) It is said: "The fourth kingdom shall devour the *whole earth*, and shall *tread it down*, and break it in pieces." (Dan. 7: 23. Comp. Ex. 15: 17; Ps. 119: 90.) When the "two thousand and three hundred days" prophetic, given for the continuance of "the vision," shall have ended, "then shall the sanctuary be cleansed;" even "the whole earth," long trodden down, will be renewed. (Dan. 8: 19)

3. No longer does "the Star of Empire westward take its way." The circuit of the earth is reached by earthly dominion. There is no other Western Continent or world to be discovered as the seat of empire. The geographical discoveries of the present day, and for the future, must be limited to arctic regions, and torrid zones, and unexplored mountains, and barren wastes, uninhabitable to mankind, and adverse to human enterprise and worldly dominion. "The east and west are met." "The first" and "the last" of the nations now meet on the Pacific slope.

"The East and West are met. The word is spoken;
China is risen!
The ancient wall that kept her so long is broken;
She steps from her prison.

"She looks with awe on the changes Time has wrought,
Old forms o'erpast;
The last of the nations first into liberty brought:
And the first is last.

"Fling wide thy gates, O land of ancient story!
And it may be
Thou shalt behold the dawn of a brighter glory
Break over thee!"

Though the world's hopeful interpretation of these verses is destined to a disappointment, yet it is well to note the fact patent to all as a sign of the times, that as "the east and west are met," we may look to

"Behold the dawn of a brighter glory
Break over thee"—

and in the east again see "the Star of Empire" begin its march; but under the dominion of "the second man, the Lord from heaven." "And thou, O Tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the *first dominion*." (Mic. 4: 8; Zech. 14: 5, 9; Matt. 25: 31–34; Rev. 11: 15–18; Dan. 7: 13, 14, 27.) A recent writer[1] asks: "What

[1] *Credo.*

is the race to do next? Is not its onward march to be soon checked by the shores of the Pacific? And will there follow a rebound from West to East over the world? Impossible! Is it to span the Pacific, strike the Asiatic coast, and begin its journey over again? Impossible! Is it to stay where it is? Impracticable. Every chapter of Geology, every page of history, every providence of God, every deep conviction of the human soul points with an index finger inflexible as steel, not to a repetition of the old story, but to its conclusion."

Hope, prophecy, and promise point us again to the east, not for "repetition of the old story," but for the restoration of "the first dominion," in "the times of restitution," under the righteous and everlasting reign of "the second Adam."

4. The earth gives unmistakable tokens of its approaching end, when its internal fires shall "consume" it "with its increase." (Deut. 32: 22.) While the hopes of the world are directed to "the far West," and to the Pacific slope, God is "shaking" the land with terrific earthquakes, and making "men's hearts to fail them for fear." (Luke 21: 26.) A writer in *The Atlantic Monthly* of November, 1869, says: "We are led to believe that the intensity of earthquakes as well as their frequency increases as we pass from the Atlantic toward the Pacific Ocean." Alluding to the earthquakes which visited the Mississippi Valley in the years of 1811, 1812, 1813, he remarks: "These are probably unprecedented in the history of earthquakes; but as it occurred, all analogies indicate the probability of its *recurrence within a century*. In all those countries which have been visited by great convulsions, where observation has extended over a great length of time, it has been found that their visits may be expected as often as about once in a hundred years. If a convulsion should revisit that region in its present populous condition, the destruction of life and property would be terrible indeed. The seismologist can have no doubt that the recurrence would ruin many of the cities of the Mississippi Valley. It is sincerely to be hoped that the conclusions of science may prove without foundation, and that this warning may be found to have as little basis as it will have effect."

Thus we are not without witness and warning from a scientific source, that we are on the eve of that "great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great." (Rev. 16.) For the whole material globe has

UMI

been shaken most fearfully within a short period, and is still more or less convulsed with the throes of "earthquakes in divers places," which like the pangs of a woman in travail have gotten hold of her, and she cannot escape.

"We read the record of the planet's page
By Ætna's glare and Cotopaxi's torch."

"The fires kindled at the foundations of the mountains" (Deut. 32: 22) upheave the Continents, the isles of the sea, and break up the floors of the oceans, causing these monstrous "tidal waves" which sweep around the world, producing fearful alarms, and terrible disasters at sea; which are a fulfillment of the signs of which Jesus spoke: "The sea and waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." (Luke 21: 25, 26.)

So frequent, and alarming, and so universal have the terrestrial convulsions of our planet become, that they now elicit and interest the study of our wisest men. Profs. Agassiz, Lyell, and others are making them at this time their special subject of investigation. Is not God speaking to us in language which cannot fail to be understood? "The end is come upon the four corners of the land. An end is come, the end is come: it watcheth for thee; behold, it is come. The morning is come upon thee, O thou that dwellest in the land; the time is come, the day of trouble is near, and not the *sounding again of the mountains.* Now will I shortly pour out my fury upon thee, and I will judge thee according to thy ways, and will recompense thee for all thine abominations. Behold, the day is come: the morning is gone forth, the rod hath blossomed, pride hath budded. Violence is risen up into a rod of wickedness;....the time is come, the day draweth near....They shall be on the mountains like doves of the valleys, all of them mourning, every one for his iniquity. All hands shall be feeble, and all knees shall be weak as water." (Ezek. 7.) "Fear, and the pit, and the snare are upon thee, O inhabitant of the earth." (Is. 24.)

Beyond this dreadful day follows the glorious restitution, to be unvisited with the curse and the fall a second time. "Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." (Is. 24.) "And the Lord of hosts shall make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of

wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined....He will swallow up death in victory: and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it. And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." (Is. 25: 6–9.)

Jehovah is now "shaking the sea and the dry land"—"the heavens and the earth;" and shaking all nations." (Hag. 2: 6.) "This *signifieth* the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear: for our God is a consuming fire." (Heb. 12: 26–28.)

"For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind." Then nothing shall "hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." (Is. 65: 17–25; 11: 9; 2 Pet. 3; Rev. 21.)

A restored earth and heavens, a restored Eden and Paradise, a restored kingdom under the dominion of "the second Adam, the Lord from heaven;" and whose kingdom and glory is without end, together with "the resurrection from the dead" is the hope of our lost and fallen race.

As we near the epoch for this glorious and "blessed hope" to be realized by those who are truly deserving of the inheritance, how we ought to heed the exhortation of an apostle to all: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heavens must receive until the times of *restitution of all things* which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts 3: 19, 21.)

Among the "poet prophets the world over who have sung of a renovated world," none have more beautifully and sweetly sung than the youthful Pollock, with whose animating verse we close our theme:

UMI

been shaken most fearfully within a short period, and is still more or less convulsed with the throes of "earthquakes in divers places," which like the pangs of a woman in travail have gotten hold of her, and she cannot escape.

"We read the record of the planet's page
By Ætna's glare and Cotopaxi's torch."

"The fires kindled at the foundations of the mountains" (Deut. 32: 22) upheave the Continents, the isles of the sea, and break up the floors of the oceans, causing these monstrous "tidal waves" which sweep around the world, producing fearful alarms, and terrible disasters at sea; which are a fulfillment of the signs of which Jesus spoke: "The sea and waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." (Luke 21: 25, 26.)

So frequent, and alarming, and so universal have the terrestrial convulsions of our planet become, that they now elicit and interest the study of our wisest men. Profs. Agassiz, Lyell, and others are making them at this time their special subject of investigation. Is not God speaking to us in language which cannot fail to be understood? "The end is come upon the four corners of the land. An end is come, the end is come: it watcheth for thee; behold, it is come. The morning is come upon thee, O thou that dwellest in the land; the time is come, the day of trouble is near, and not the *sounding again of the mountains.* Now will I shortly pour out my fury upon thee, and I will judge thee according to thy ways, and will recompense thee for all thine abominations. Behold, the day is come: the morning is gone forth, the rod hath blossomed, pride hath budded. Violence is risen up into a rod of wickedness;....the time is come, the day draweth near....They shall be on the mountains like doves of the valleys, all of them mourning, every one for his iniquity. All hands shall be feeble, and all knees shall be weak as water." (Ezek. 7.) "Fear, and the pit, and the snare are upon thee, O inhabitant of the earth." (Is. 24.)

Beyond this dreadful day follows the glorious restitution, to be unvisited with the curse and the fall a second time. "Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." (Is. 24.) "And the Lord of hosts shall make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of

wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined....He will swallow up death in victory: and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it. And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." (Is. 25: 6–9.)

Jehovah is now "shaking the sea and the dry land"—"the heavens and the earth;" and shaking all nations." (Hag. 2: 6.) "This *signifieth* the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear: for our God is a consuming fire." (Heb. 12: 26–28.)

"For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind." Then nothing shall "hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." (Is. 65: 17–25; 11: 9; 2 Pet. 3; Rev. 21.)

A restored earth and heavens, a restored Eden and Paradise, a restored kingdom under the dominion of "the second Adam, the Lord from heaven;" and whose kingdom and glory is without end, together with "the resurrection from the dead" is the hope of our lost and fallen race.

As we near the epoch for this glorious and "blessed hope" to be realized by those who are truly deserving of the inheritance, how we ought to heed the exhortation of an apostle to all: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heavens must receive until the times of *restitution of all things* which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts 3: 19, 21.)

Among the "poet prophets the world over who have sung of a renovated world," none have more beautifully and sweetly sung than the youthful Pollock, with whose animating verse we close our theme:

UMI

"So burned the world upon that dreadful day;
Yet not to full annihilation burned:
The essential particles remained
Purged by the final, sanctifying fires,
From all corruption; from all stains of sin,
Done there by man or devil; purified
The essential particles remained, of which
God built the world again, renewed, improved,
With fertile vale, and wood of fertile bough;
And mountain cinctured with perpetual green;
In clime and season fruitful, as at *first*
When Adam woke, unfallen, in Paradise."

OBJECT OF THE PRESENT DISPENSATION.

The object of the present dispensation is briefly declared in the Word. It is briefly and plainly expressed by St. James in the first Great Council, the Apostolical Council, in Jerusalem, in 53. At that council Peter gave an account of how he had been chosen to carry the Gospel to the Gentiles; Paul and Barnabas gave an account of their missionary tour; and after there had been much discussion James got up and said, "Simeon hath declared how God at first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name," and the language is remarkable. It is not to take the Gentiles or to take the nation, but to *take out of them* a people for his name. And I mention this emphatically because the ordinary mode of speech concerning this subject seems to me to be and to convey this impression, that the design of the present dispensation is the conversion of the whole of mankind. To those who think so I cannot but feel that the history of our missionary efforts must be very discouraging, whereas, if we will put everything in its proper place and in its proper time, according as we find it in the Word of God, I believe the success of our efforts has been, not all that our hearts could desire, but all that we had a reason to expect. We are not competent to form a judgment on some of the principles involved in this question. We are not at liberty to choose whom we shall address. Our duty is to address all—to address the Word to every creature as far as it lies in us to do so; but it has pleased God to announce to us his design, and while the command is imperative upon us to act as if every creature might be called and might be converted, he has taught us his plan. It is to *take out* a people for his name, individuals Christianized in truth. This has been done.—*Dr. McNeile.*

"The right disposition of mind is that which desires earnestly *the truth*, in whatever manner it may come to us."—*John Foster.*

"The doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and the name, are alike unknown to the entire Bible."—*Dr. Olshausen.*

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

By The Editor.

"Thy kingdom come." (Matt. 6: 10.)

In the second chapter of Daniel we find recorded a wonderful dream, by means of which the God of heaven granted to the Assyrian king the desire of his heart, to "know what should come to pass hereafter." (v. 29.) This dream and its sure interpretation have been preserved for the instruction of God's people; the accurate fulfillment of that portion of it which relates to past history being not only a pledge of the fulfillment of the rest of the vision, but, also, an unimpeachable testimony to the truthfulness and inspiration of the Holy Bible.

The symbols of this vision are a great metallic image in the form of a man, and a stone. These, according to their inspired explication, represent five notable, successive empires, destined to bear rule in the earth. The first of these, denoted by the image's golden head, was Babylon, which gave place to the Medo-Persian kingdom, symbolized by the breast and arms of silver. The belly and the thighs were of brass, prefiguring the kingdom of "the brazen-coated Greeks," destined to bear rule over the known world. The legs of iron, that metal which breaks in pieces and subdues all things, stood for that mighty empire whose seven-hilled capital was boastfully called "the Eternal City," which brake in pieces and bruised the nations of earth. But as it brake in pieces and destroyed other kingdoms, so it was itself destined to be broken, as symbolized by the feet and toes of the image, which were composed of a mixture of iron and miry clay, which can never be welded into a homogeneous mass; signifying not only that Rome should be divided, but that there should never be a permanent union of the fragments, however much they might be mingled together, nor another universal dominion, until that symbolized by the stone should be inaugurated.

This last event is announced to occur "in the days of these kings," that is, of the powers represented by the feet and toes of the image, which are the divisions or fragments of Rome.

The reader should observe that while in the dream Nebuchad-

UMI

nezzar saw the image complete, that in the fulfillment it is only constructed by the march of events, and the different sections are not contemporaneous, but successive. The head, or Babylon, passes away, giving place to the breast and arms, or Medo-Persia, which in turn are succeeded by the belly and thighs of brass, or Grecia, which are followed by the legs of iron, Rome, upon whose dissolution the feet and toes, or the divisions of Rome, appear in history. This thought is of no slight importance, because it sets aside forever all those theories which find in the stone of this vision a figure of the gospel or of the gospel church. For whatever the stone may represent, it is *the successor* of the feet and toes upon the stage of prophetic action: for it is expressly stated that the stone "smote the image *upon his feet*, which were of iron and clay." Now it not only could not smite the feet until they came into existence, but it could not smite them until they had attained their maturity and filled their allotted portion of this world's time. The stone kingdom, therefore, cannot appear until some time after the permanent division of the Roman empire, which did not occur until the fifth century, some four hundred years after the gospel was introduced, and the church organized; hence, neither of these are symbolized by the stone.

And to say that the gospel, or the church, is the kingdom figured by the stone, is to set aside the inspired explication, and make the stone fall upon the legs of iron some centuries before the feet were developed; for it is undeniable that the gospel was introduced during Rome's palmiest days. The story of the Savior's birth is inseparably connected with the decree, which Rome could not only promulgate, but enforce, that *all* the world should be taxed. It was the Augustan age of the empire; not the era of weakness or division.

But these theories also pervert the symbolism of the vision, not only as to chronology, but as to action. They reduce to a slow, grinding process, that which in the dream itself appears as a sudden, overwhelming, and everlasting destruction. The symbol portrays a catastrophe. A boulder (not a "little stone," as the abrasionists must necessarily have it) rolls from its place in the mountain, and falls with irresistible force upon the feet of the image. The result is annihilation: for gold, silver, brass, iron, and clay were broken to pieces together, and "became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors: and the wind carried

them away, that *no place was found for them*." (v. 35.) The stone, said Daniel, "shall break in pieces and consume" the image. What must be the straits of a theory which resolves such a figure as this into a tedious, sluggish, and wearisome grinding process, with frequent occasion for doubt as to whether it is the Stone or the Image which is being reduced in its proportions!

Does not the closing language of both vision and interpretation force upon our minds the scenes of the judgment, rather than of the dispensation of mercy? Are we not reminded of the Psalmist's prophecy: "The ungodly....are like the chaff which the wind driveth away?" (Ps. 1: 4.) Or of Job's exclamation: "They are as stubble before the wind, and as chaff that the storm carrieth away?" (ch. 21: 18.) And of the Baptist's stern denunciation, who, though varying the agency employed, consigns "the chaff" to equally certain destruction in "unquenchable fire?" As well reduce these expressions to figures of conversion and the progress of the gospel, as make the symbolic destruction of the image a trope of such results.

We need not mistake our position on the stream of time. The great sea of eternity is just before us. We live in the extremities of that section of the image upon which the stone is destined to fall. Having destroyed the kingdoms of this world, it will then "become a great mountain, and fill the whole earth." It will never remove to heaven, nor to any other sphere, either piecemeal, or in its totality; but, in the language of the prophet: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter: and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure." (vv. 44, 45.)

In the seventh of Daniel we find another and much more definite prophetic outline of the world's history. Babylon is here represented by a lion, Medo-Persia by a bear, Grecia by a leopard, and Rome by a terrible nondescript beast; and additional particulars of the history of each kingdom are furnished. But special interest attaches to the new symbols of the period succeeding the division of the Roman empire. The inspired gloss

UMI

of Nebuchadnezzar's dream gave no definite information as to the division of Rome, nor its subsequent history. But in this chapter not only are particulars given, but chronology, also. The period of twelve hundred and sixty days is here first introduced, as "a time, times, and a half," measuring the dominancy of the Papacy, which is symbolized by a "little horn" with a face like a man, which came up among the ten horns of the great Roman beast. This "little horn" is described as making war with the saints, and prevailing against them until "judgment was given to [i. e., in favor of] the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom."

Now it is absurd to refer this language to the introduction of the gospel. For here, as everywhere, the event of giving the kingdom to the saints is placed at the judgment, in a state of incorruptibility. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom," says Paul. (1 Cor. 15: 50.) That is, *mortal men* cannot possess it; for flesh and blood is evidently here put, by a metonymy, for mortal man.[1] Mortal saints cannot inherit the kingdom, and, therefore, it cannot be of this world; for while it continues saints will continue mortal. This view is confirmed by the Savior himself, in his language to Pilate: "My kingdom is not of *this world*;.... is not from hence." How is it, then, that many of his professed disciples, with this plain declaration of the Master before their eyes, dare assert that it *is* of "this world;" that it can and does exist in the present order of things; that it *was* set up in the Savior's day (was "from hence"), or at latest at Pentecost; that it is progressing, and is destined *in this way* to conquer and entirely pervade "*this world?*"

It is true that some of the elements of the coming kingdom are to be found here. This is the territory; here the subjects are being gathered out of all nations, tongues, and people, and many of them "sleep in the dust of the earth." But the kingdom is in the hands of usurpers and rebels, who mostly refuse either to heed warnings of impending doom, or accept freely proffered mercy. To them God speaks in the second Psalm: "Be wise now, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son lest

[1] As when Paul says—"Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood"—not with *mortal man*. (Gal. 1: 16.) "We wrestle not against flesh and blood"—against *mortal men*. (Eph. 6: 12.) The Savior once used the same figure in addressing Peter: "Flesh and blood [mortal man] hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven." (Matt. 16: 17.) And the same trope is used in Heb. 2: 14, to signify a mortal nature, or an organization subject to death.

he be angry, and ye perish from the way [not be converted] when his wrath be kindled but a little." Why this exhortation? It is because their possessions are promised to the Son of God for an inheritance: "Ask of me and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." While he tarries in the "far country," there is room for reconciliation; but when he comes into his regal inheritance he "shall break them with a rod of iron, and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel"—and surely *this* is not an emblem of their conversion!

The Pope claims that Christ's kingdom is of this world, and wearing his triple crown, as vicar of King Jesus, freely asserts, though he dare not venture an attempt to enforce, his claims to the sovereignty of earth and all it contains. He is even now in council with his ecclesiastics to concoct some scheme by which his lost temporal power may be recovered, though we know from the sure word of prophecy the effort will prove a failure. His kingdom is a counterfeit of the true one. His system, with all those theories which make the kingdom to be in the heart, or in the church, directly contradicts not only the Savior's declaration to Pilate, but also the numerous passages which locate it at the resurrection, at the judgment, at the last day, at his appearing, when the King shall come, not with a sin-offering, to be wounded again for the transgressions of others, or be bruised for their iniquities, but in his glory, and in the glory of the Father, and with all the holy angels, to destroy his enemies, introduce a new order of things, and establish his throne with justice and judgment from henceforth even forever. *Then* will be the time spoken of by the prophet, "that the saints possessed the kingdom."

We here remark that the kingdom to be given to the saints, Christ's kingdom, the kingdom of God, and the kingdom of heaven, are one and the same kingdom, presented in different aspects, or viewed from various standpoints. This is easily proved. (1) The locality of each is on earth. (2) They are each established at the judgment. (3) They are each to endure forever. That "things equal to the same thing are equal to each other," is a settled axiom in mathematics; and the principle applies with equal force here. Occupying the same territory, dating from a common epoch, eternal in their nature, the fact of the identity of these kingdoms cannot be evaded. They are one.

UMI

It is said to be given to the saints, because its territory, the earth, is to be their everlasting heritage. It is the kingdom of Christ, because he is to be its immortal ruler. It is the kingdom of God, set up for his glory and in his power. It is called the kingdom of heaven because of its nature: in it, God's will is to be done as it is done in heaven: righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit are its characteristics.

In harmony with this principle, the prophet sees the same dominion which in ch. 2: 44 is called the kingdom of God conferred upon the Messiah:

> "I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom, that which shall not be destroyed." (Dan. 7: 13, 14.)

Those who would give Jesus his kingdom this side of the resurrection, may not cavil about the terms "forever" and "everlasting," and their, perhaps oftener than otherwise, limited sense. The context indicates that the force of the words is here the strongest possible. The dominion is not only everlasting, but it "shall not pass away," nor "be destroyed." If these terms, taken in connection with parallel texts, do not signify eternal duration, then language cannot be framed to express that idea.

The notion that the people of God are to become possessors of a kingdom *in* heaven, or *above* and *beyond* the heavens, or anywhere else except on this earth, meets with the Divine repudiation in the following quotation:

> "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom UNDER THE WHOLE HEAVEN, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." (v. 27.)

If the kingdom is *under the whole heaven*, it can never be in it.

Another prophet says:

> "And thou, O tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem." (Mic. 4: 8.)

The "tower of the flock" must be Jesus, our strong-tower, in whom we find our refuge and defence. "The daughter of Jerusalem" can include only those whose names shall be found written in the Book of Life; for in the new earth only the righteous shall dwell (2 Pet. 3: 13), and

"Naught unclean or hateful
Shall ever enter there."

"The first dominion" is that originally given to Adam, when he was made ruler of the whole earth. (Gen. 1: 26.) While he maintained his integrity it was an inalienable dominion: he was lord of all. But he forfeited his estate, which the second Adam has purchased, and will in due time redeem. Meanwhile, his people, comforted by "the earnest of their inheritance" in him —that blessed Spirit which is to quicken their mortal bodies into everlasting life at his coming—with patience await his return in glory to put them in full possession. (Eph. 1: 13, 14; Rom. 8: 11–23.)

This view of the kingdom we confirm, and the Whitbyan theory is at the same time overturned, by Jesus' interpretation of his parable of the wheat and tares. It is as follows:

> "He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in *the end of this world*. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. THEN shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. *Who hath ears to hear let him hear.*" (Matt. 13: 37–43.)

We will not undertake to explain the Savior's explanation, but in passing call attention to some of the salient points of the parable. When some would have rooted out the tares as soon as they appeared, the Sower forbade them, saying, "Let *both grow together until the harvest*:" and as he himself tells us "the harvest is *the end of the age* [*aionos*]", the theory of the world's conversion is effectually excluded. There is no period previous to the harvest [the judgment] when the field [the world] does not contain both classes—the righteous and the wicked. Nor does the Sower come, be his coming what or when it may, to convert tares into wheat, but to destroy them utterly—"gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity," whose doom is first found in the furnace of unquenchable fire, and "THEN shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."

To what other kingdom than that foretold by Daniel could the Savior refer when he taught his disciples to pray—"Thy kingdom come?" True, they had some misconceptions of its nature

UMI

and era, expecting it in the temporal instead of the eternal state. Bnt they could hardly have conceived that the words "Thy kingdom come!" would ever be tortured into a blind allusion to Christians *going* to a kingdom in some other sphere; much less that the Lord meant by the kingdom the gospel, or good news of the kingdom: for *that* had already come. The Baptist had not neglected his mission; the disciples had heard the glad tidings; but the notion that the news of a thing could be the thing itself appears never to have entered their minds.

The idea that the glad tidings of the kingdom was the kingdom itself, could never obtain in the church until the misbelief of immaterialism prepared the way for such an egregious error by making the promised literal kingdom upon earth entirely useless and unnecessary. But having located the inheritance of the saints where God nor his word ever promised it, a necessity arose for *some* application or disposition of the language relating to the kingdom he *had* promised; therefore, according to the exigency of the case, the kingdom means the gospel, the gospel dispensation, a state of grace in the heart, the Christian church, a spiritual reign of Christ here, or the heavenly world above. Is it any wonder that the word of God has become to most a sealed book, hard to be understood, when there is such confusion of thought concerning terms of fundamental importance, such latitude allowed in the interpretation of phrases concerning which we may justly affirm, that a knowledge of their definite import is indispensable to a correct understanding of the Scriptures?

As before remarked, the disciples did not fully comprehend the nature of the kingdom of God, though they had a general idea that it was to be literal, on earth, and belonged only to the people of God. *These* ideas Jesus never sought to confute, though he did by parables or otherwise show their mistake concerning the era of his reign, or promised clearer light after the Holy Spirit should be given. Thus when just previous to the ascension they inquired—"Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" he replied—"It is not for you to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath placed in his own power." It was not yet *time* for that question to be clearly understood. But, the Savior added, "*ye shall receive power after that* the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem....and unto the uttermost parts of

the earth." And they did witness of him as the coming King, so that one part of their enemies' accusation against them was that they said "there is another king, one Jesus." (Acts 17: 7.) And in the time of Domitian the question of the coming kingdom was so prominent as to awaken the apprehensions of the Emperor. Eusebius relates that Domitian ordered the relatives of our Lord to be brought before him, when he questioned them concerning Christ and his kingdom, what was its nature, and when and where it was to appear. They replied "that it was not a temporal or an earthly kingdom, but celestial and angelic; that it would appear in the end of the world, when coming in glory he would judge the quick and the dead, and give to every one according to his works." They anticipated a kingdom *to come*, and had no thought that it was already inaugurated. They enjoyed the pure light which shone after the descent of the promised Comforter, Remembrancer, and Expositor. But their profession of faith met much the same reception from the Roman emperor as it does now from a professed orthodoxy: for Domitian "despised them as simpletons, and treated them with contempt." Still we do not hesitate to declare the emperor wrong, and the humble disciples and relatives of our Lord right.

When James to encourage the humble-minded says—"God hath chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, *heirs* of the kingdom *he hath promised* to them that love him," the language could not possibly have suggested to their minds a kingdom in heaven, for they had no promise on record of a kingdom there. But they could all read from the book of Daniel an assurance that such as they should possess "the kingdom *under* the whole heaven." Moreover, he addresses them as "heirs" only: they are not possessors. So Paul says the saints are "*heirs of* God, and *joint-heirs* with Jesus Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also *glorified together*." (Rom. 8: 17.) And we have already seen that it is in the restitution that Jesus is *to* sit upon "the throne of his glory" (Matt. 19: 28); and Paul goes on to show that the unspeakable glory to be revealed in us, is to be manifested in "the adoption, that is, the redemption of our body." (v. 23.)

To these "joint-heirs" that proclamation from heaven concerning the new creation is addressed—"He that overcometh shall inherit all [these] things!" (Rev. 21: 6.) This is that kingdom which, says Jesus, it is the Father's good pleasure to give to his

UMI

"little flock," which they are to seek even at the expense of all worldly good, and for the first approach of which they are to watch, with trimmed lamps, and girded loins, like servants awaiting the return of an absent Lord, ready to open the moment he shall knock. Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching.

Undoubtedly the phrase kingdom of God and its cognate terms always refers, directly or indirectly, to the future, coming kingdom; but no one will claim that those terms *always* allude to its organized and perfected condition. A kingdom consists of at least three essential elements: a king, subjects, and territory. In certain relations it is proper to speak of either of them separately, or of any combination of these, or other elements of a kingdom, as *the* kingdom. In Scripture the terms king and kingdom are frequently used interchangeably. "Thou, O king," said Daniel, "art this head of gold:....after *thee* shall arise *another kingdom.*" Here the king, as its ruler and head, stands for his kingdom. And when God says—"At what instant I speak concerning *a kingdom* to destroy it," manifestly he refers to the people, and not the territory. But when we read of his gift to Israel of *the kingdoms* of Canaan, it is equally manifest that the gift consisted in the territory only, very properly in such relation styled *the kingdom.*

In the above, and all similar cases, we by the context and general sense of the passages where they occur, readily determine the sense of the word. If we will but apply the same rule to the phrase 'kingdom of God,' or its cognate expressions, we shall find relief from that confusion of thought and reasoning which have arisen from the corruptions of mystical and spiritualizing systems of interpretation.

We have shown that the essential elements of the kingdom of heaven are all in existence, but are in a disorganized condition. Yet, in accordance with the law of interpretation cited above, any of its elements, those we have mentioned, or others, may be spoken of as *the* kingdom. Here is a key to unlock the parables of our Savior, and a light upon many sayings of the apostles which have been befogged by "the mystical doctors."

Because Paul said—"The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom. 14: 17), the doctors have forbidden the church to look for anything like a *material* kingdom: it is entirely spiritual, they

cry. But if they insist upon their gloss of this passage, let them not shrink from the logical deduction that the kingdom of God consists of these abstract qualities, *apart from personalities:* and if they admit that these qualities refer to the character of the inhabitants of the kingdom, they give us the argument; for material beings may and do possess the requisite character. And that this is the true sense the context plainly shows: "He that in these things serveth Christ [in righteousness, etc. without regard to meats and drinks, and carnal ordinances], is acceptable to God," and therefore fitted for his kingdom. In this case, then, the phrase 'kingdom of God' is used of the character of its occupants. For "the *un*righteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God." (1 Cor. 6: 9.)

When we read—"the kingdom of God has come nigh you," or "come unto you," reference is plainly made to the offer of the kingdom by its being preached. And again, when it is said—"The kingdom of God is not in word, but in power" (1 Cor. 4: 20), we find an explanation elsewhere, when the apostle says—"My preaching [of the gospel of the kingdom] was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." (1 Cor. 2: 4.) There was an element of power in his proclamation of the kingdom not to be found in the words of those opposers who were vainly puffed up in their fleshly mind.

But did not Paul say—"And hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son?" (Col. 1: 13.) Certainly he did. And Isaiah said—"To us a child *is* born." But he did not mean he was already, or then born; but that he certainly would come into the world, as he did appear some hundreds of years after. The prophet used a very common trope—the *prolepsis.* And when Paul says those delivered from the power of darkness are translated into the kingdom of the Son of God's love, he uses the same figure of speech. That he does so will appear from an appeal to the context. In ch. 3 he tells the same disciples that they *shall receive* the reward of the inheritance, of which they had been made meet to become partakers—not that they were already in it. (v. 24.) And he says in v. 4—"When Christ who is our life shall appear [in *his* glory], then shall ye also appear with him in glory;" or "THEN shine forth in the kingdom." (Matt. 13: 44.)

But among all the absurdities of the mystical school, there is

UMI

none more ridiculous in conception than the notion of "holy violence" on the part of those seeking religion, which is their gloss of this passage—"The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." The connection plainly indicates an allusion to *un*holy rather than holy violence; to the treatment bestowed upon the Baptist, the Savior, and their disciples, the heralds of the kingdom at hand.

And this suggests notice of another supposed difficulty in the treatment of this subject. Eighteen hundred years have rolled away, and the kingdom has not yet come. How then could the Baptist and his successors preach it as 'at hand?' We reply that 'at hand' is a comparative term. The Sabbath is *at hand* on Friday; the new year, in November; and the close of a century is *at hand* during any of its later years, according to the relations of the subject. Four thousand of earth's weary years were passed. Two days of its week remained as the era for the proclamation throughout the world of the coming eternal Sabbath of rest. The fourth kingdom of the prophetic vision was already in existence, at the summit of its power, and next in order was to be the kingdom of God, which in a comparative sense was said to be "at hand." But the Lord enumerated certain signs which were first to appear, by which, when the church should behold them, she might know that the kingdom of God was "*nigh at hand*"—"*nigh, even at the door*" (Matt. 24: 33; Luke 21: 31), an important qualification of the previous announcement.

It is also urged that the kingdom must be in the past, because Jesus once said—"There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God." (Luke 9: 27.) This remark is recorded by three of the evangelists. Mark reads —"until they see the kingdom of God come with power;" Matthew, "until they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." And we remark in passing that this variation in terms is an additional and unimpeachable evidence of the identity of Christ's kingdom with the kingdom of God.

Having seen the abundant testimony that the kingdom of God is to be given in the resurrection, shall we, contrary to all received rules of exegesis, explain a multitude of passages by this one? or, rather, look for an interpretation which while it shall preserve the unities of the narrative, and do no violence to its

context, shall also harmonize with the general tenor of the Scriptures? Surely the latter is the only course open to us.

And, first, the context stands directly across the path of those who would fain lead us from this text into a belief that the kingdom of heaven was literally established in the apostle's days. Did Jesus come in their day in his own glory, and that of the Father, and that of the angels, and before them publicly put to shame those who had been ashamed of him "in this sinful generation?" (Luke 9: 26; Mark 8: 38.) Did he "*then reward every man* according to his works?" (Matt. 16: 27.) If these events have not occurred, then Jesus has not appeared, and therefore his kingdom *has not come:* consequently he could not have referred to his literal second advent in glory when he said—"There be some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." And to claim that he did, is to involve him in altogether too evident a self-contradiction; to make him gainsay, or impugn in this last sentence his own immediately preceding statement.

In Matthew a new chapter, and in Mark and Luke a "paragraph," notify us that with the verse we are discussing the subject under consideration is dropped, and a *new topic* introduced. But the chapter is wrongly divided, and the "paragraphs" are at fault: for they separate the promise from its fulfillment. When the promise is made it is immediately added that after about a week's time Jesus took Peter, James, and John up into a high mountain apart, and showed them the scene we know as the transfiguration; and thus his words were fulfilled. He was glorified in their presence. The fashion of that countenance "more marred than any man" was altered; nor could they stedfastly behold its glory, but fell before him apparently or really in a trance. Nor did Jesus seem alone in his glory; for there appeared with him in the vision, representatives of the church who "when Christ who is our life shall appear, shall also appear with him in glory" (Col. 3: 4), Moses and Elijah. It was the kingdom of God in miniature. The King was "seen in his beauty;" Moses stood for those now dead and buried, but who shall be "raised incorruptible" in order to possess the kingdom; while Eljah was the type of those who shall not sleep, but, changed to immortality in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump, and together with the sleepers in Jesus, who have first been resur-

UMI

rected, shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, and so be forever with him. (1 Cor. 15: 51; 1 Thess. 4: 16, 17.)

The scene was entrancingly glorious, and it is no wonder Peter desired to abide there permanently. But the vision faded, *for it was only a vision, and not a reality.* And as they came down from the mount Jesus charged them to "tell *the vision* to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead." He had shown them the kingdom of God, as at a later day John saw the new earth and its capital—in vision.

This experience gave Peter boldness in affirming the expected, glorious *parousia.* He says:

"We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, *when we were with him in the holy mount.*" (2 Pet 1: 16–18.)

From this language it is evident that Peter understood the promise that he should not taste death until he should first see the kingdom, to be fulfilled in the vision on the mount. Having beheld this miniature representation of the scene, he could confidently proclaim the future "power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," into his kingdom which shall have "no end."

But we are asked—"If his kingdom is to thus stand forever, how can it be 'delivered up,' according to the statement in 1 Cor. 15: 24?" Many understand this passage of Christ giving up his throne and ceasing to reign; but there is a more consistent explication of the text. As we have shown, the word 'kingdom' has various relations and significations, which are to be determined by the sense of the context. The kingdom here said to be "delivered up" is a rebellious kingdom, not that of the saints. And the event occurs when Christ ceases to plead for mankind as their Mediator and High Priest. The world's probation having expired, it is by its Mediator "delivered up"—for the words are used in a *legal sense*—for judgment. This is to the end that those who would not have him to reign over them, together with all of the enemies of himself and his people, may be destroyed, or put under his feet. Then subject to the Father, he will take his seat upon the throne of the new world, and his kingdom "shall never be destroyed."

But the spiritualizers have one more resort. They ask if we have forgotten that "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation;" that Jesus said it "is within you?" In view of the foregoing arguments we might justly demand of our opposers a revision of their explanation of this confessedly difficult passage; and that they give us one that shall not conflict with David, Daniel, Peter, Paul, James, John, and Jesus himself. But lest it be thought that we fear the issue, we will try the strength of this stronghold of professed orthodoxy. But let us first quote the Savior's language:

"And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, Lo there! for behold, the kingdom of God is within you."

We have said that the passage is obscure: and why should it not be? The question was doubtless put in a spirit of scoffing and derision. It came from a class who had closed their ears and hardened their hearts when Jesus taught plainly, without the use of parables. They had fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, with hearts waxed gross, ears dull of hearing, and eyes closed to the true light of the gospel of the kingdom. And because of this, it is said, "without a parable spake he not unto them," that though *hearing* they might not understand rejected truth. (Matt. 13: 10–17, 34.)

But if the passage was originally hard to be understood, why involve it in a deeper obscurity by requiring of us such a stretch of faith as to believe that Jesus said to the same class he had denounced as "stiff-necked," "hypocrites," "devourers of the poor," "whited sepulchers, full of dead men's bones," a "generation of vipers," of their "father the devil," and doing "his works," that the spiritual kingdom of God—"righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit—was *within them!* For "he answered *them* and said,.... the kingdom of God is *within you!*" Here is obscurity obscured, "darkness to be felt."

In looking for the probable sense of the passage, we observe, first, that although the Pharisees' question related to the *time* when the kingdom should come, the Savior in reply says nothing of the era, but speaks only of the *manner* of its coming. "It cometh not with observation," or "with outward show," as the margin and many scholars render it. Its approach will not be previously heralded with a display of royal pomp and magnificence—"outward show." "Neither shall they say lo, here! or

UMI

lo, there! [and why?] for behold the kingdom of God is [not *within*, but according to the margin] among you," or in your midst. When it appears its manifestation will be sudden, and all alike will know that it has come.

That this is the sense of this difficult passage appears from the context. Turning from his contemptuous interlocutors, "he said unto his disciples, The days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man [*i. e.*, in his kingdom], and ye shall not see it. And they shall say to you [in the midst of your persecutions and perplexity], See here! or see there! [*i. e.*, *Here* is the manifestation of the Son of man; or *there* is the promised kingdom; but, says Jesus], go not after them nor follow them. [Why? Because when the kingdom does really come, the fact will be instantaneously and universally known, and there will be no opportunity for one to inform another of the event,] for as the lightning that lighteneth out of one part under heaven, and shineth unto the other part under heaven, *so, also, shall the Son of man be in his day.*" And he then further illustrates the suddenness of his appearing by the days of Noah and the fall of Sodom. In each case the people of God were prepared for the impending event, of which *no outward sign* was visible; but upon the ungodly it came like the lightning's flash; and in the same day that the righteous were delivered, the wicked found themselves involved in one sudden, common ruin.

This lesson, yet more clearly taught in Matt. 24: 28–29, forever excludes all conceptions of a local, secret, or spiritual coming of Christ in his kingdom. If such illustrations as the lightning's flash, the fate of the antediluvians, the doom of Sodom, can be perverted into symbols of a secret action or event, an obscure or hidden movement, a gradual conversion of individuals and nations, then language must cease to have any value as a means to convey ideas.

Why then, when the manner of the coming of Christ in his kingdom is so plainly declared, should any cling to the theory of a spiritual advent in the heart, or by the spread of the gospel among the nations. Truth is better than error. Consistency and harmony of interpretation must prove more effective in the spread of Bible doctrine than mysticism and confusion of tongues. Let us allow the Book to interpret itself.

"God is his own interpreter,
And he will make it plain."

If the preceding arguments are just, there is no escaping the conclusion that the last sands of time are running out. The first four great kingdoms of prophecy are all in the past. The kingdoms of the divided Roman empire have long held their sway; that wonderful power foreshown by the "little horn" is in the last stages of that decline which was immediately to precede the fifth prophetic universal kingdom. Therefore we must be near the time when the stone cut from the mountain without hands shall fall upon the kingdoms of earth; and while they shall pass away like chaff before the wind, the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall fill the whole earth, and it shall stand forever. Amen. Thy kingdom come!

A QUESTION FOR THE TIMES.

The question we now wish to propose is this: *Does* "LEAVEN," *as spoken of in God's word, ever mean diffusive good?* Why we call this "a question for the times," will be stated hereafter.

Many persons will at once answer "Yes," and quote the Lord's words in Matt. 13: 33, as in their opinion settling the question in the affirmative: "Another parable spake he unto them; The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened." We are quite aware that this is the popular idea; but is it *true?* In order to arrive at a right conclusion, it will be necessary to look at all the places in Scripture where the word "leaven" is used as a symbol or figure. Jesus said, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees." (Matt. 16: 6, 11; Mark 8: 15; Luke 12: 11, 12.) The Corinthians are thus warned and exhorted by means of this symbol: "Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: therefore, let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." (1 Cor. 5: 7, 8.) The apostle, in writing to the Galatians, among whom false doctrines had spread, uses the same words that he had used to the Corinthians: "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." (Gal. 5: 9.) On this sentence Dr. Doddridge well remarks, in his paraphrase on 1 Cor. 5: 6: "Thus will evil examples tend to spread in the Church; and if a brand of infamy be not quickly set upon the incorrigible offender, wickedness will grow familiar, and lose its horror, so that many other members of your society may be polluted, ensnared, and dishonored."

Thus doctrinal error and practical iniquity are both described

UMI

by this terse sentence. It is observable, also, that in 1 Cor. 5: 7 Christians are spoken of, not as leavened, but as *unleavened.* "Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, *as ye are unleavened;*" that is, "as ye are by your Christian profession *unleavened*, let there be no mixture of anything inconsistent with the simplicity and purity which the gospel teaches and requires." Therefore he exhorts them to be as diligent to discover and purge out whatever leaven is an emblem of, as the Jews were before their passover to discover and remove all leaven from their dwellings. Strange direction this, if the characteristic of a true Christian is to be "*leavened.*"

With regard to *typical* sacrifices and offerings, we read: "Ye shall put away leaven seven days" (Ex. 12: 15; 13: 7); "Ye shall not offer the blood of my sacrifices with leaven" (Ex. 13: 18; 34: 25); "No meat-offering shall be made with leaven." (Lev. 2: 11; 6: 17; 10: 12.)

In the first class of texts just quoted, leaven is evidently used as an emblem of *diffusive evil*, and not of "diffusive good." The general prohibition of leaven in God's offerings is not at all in favor of its being a symbol of blessing, but rather the opposite. It is true that an exception is made in some few instances as regards the Levitical offerings; but these only serve to confirm the view here taken. [1]

We just observe in passing, that *salt*, which has properties the very opposite of leaven, was called for in the very sacrifices in which leaven was forbidden. "With all thy offerings thou shalt offer salt." (Lev. 2: 13.)

The broad fact is now before us, that wherever in the Scriptures leaven is used as a symbol, it has God's *ban* put upon it; it is marked, yea, *branded* as an evil thing; and it would be strange indeed if our Lord, in this parable, used it as an emblem of truth triumphing in the heart and the world, through God's special blessing. We do not think that Matt. 13: 33 and parallel passages are exceptions to the general rule that leaven means the activity of evil, and describes its power to corrupt that which is good, by assimilating it to its own nature.

This view agrees best also with the connection in which these words are found. In Matt. 13 we find seven parables; in three of them—"the sower," "the wheat and tares," and "the dragnet"—there is a mixture of good and evil; in two of them—"the treasure hid in the field" and "the pearl"—something wholly good is referred to; in the two remaining ones—"the mustard-

[1] "In Lev. 7: 13 leaven is used to typify *our* leavened character in contrast with that of Christ—the unleavened meat-offering being brought to denote the character of Christ, and leavened bread being brought as a type of ours. Again, in Lev. 23 the *new* meat-offering presented on the day of Pentecost was, as part of its distinctive character, to have leaven in it, it being thereby indicated that the Church is *not*, like the meat-offering, capable of being burnt on the altar, but that it had evil in it. Accordingly, the *new* meat-offering was waved before the Lord, in token of its being accepted, but it was not permitted to be burned; and it was only accepted on the ground of the burnt-offering, meat-offering, peace-offering, &c., being offered with it, whereby the leaven present in it was atoned for."—*B. W. Newton, on the Meat-Offering*, pp. 99, 100.

seed becoming a tree" and "the leaven"—we think the growth and spread of evil is described.

This view of the parable of the leaven agrees best with the *facts* of the case. Has the course of the gospel dispensation, during more than 1,800 years, exhibited most the gradual growth of good, or the spread of evil? We refer, of course, to the whole of Christendom; and surely all must answer that the history of Christendom has not been the history of progressive good. The apostles, before they died, saw evil doctrines and practices, like leaven, fermenting and spreading among professing Christians, and testified: "The mystery of iniquity doth already work" (2 Thess. 2: 7); "Even now there are many anti-Christs." (1 John 2: 18.) The evil spread rapidly after their death, so that within less than 200 years the distinctive truths which they taught were almost lost sight of, formalism prevailed, and worldliness, like a flood, soon came in. The result was Popery in the west, and a debased form of Christianity in the east. Both triumphed through many dark ages; they still delude and curse multitudes in various nations. As a proof, consider what is now going on at Rome. In addition to these scripture parallels and historical facts, it may be well to consider the following remarks on leaven as a *substance.* "In this country," observes Dr. Tregelles, "where yeast is so commonly used for making bread, what leaven really is, its nature and effects, are but little understood; hence it is often not known to be incipient corruption spreading through the mass of dough, rendering the whole *sour*, and, if not baked presently, also corrupt." In Dr. Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, in an article in which leaven and fermented substances are contrasted with salt, we find the following remarks: "Plutarch assigns as the reason why the priest of Jupiter was not allowed to touch leaven, that it comes out of corruption and corrupts that with which it is mingled." The organic chemists define the process of fermentation, and the substance which makes it, as follows: "Fermentation is nothing else but the putrefaction of a substance containing no nitrogen. Ferment, or yeast, is a substance in a state of putrefaction, the atoms of which are in a continual motion."

According to these definitions and descriptions, and also according to the general usage of the term in scripture, leaven must be considered as an emblem of decay, death, and putrefaction. Can it be that a substance which is not merely corruptible, but *corruption*, should be a symbol of that which is life-giving; *i. e.*, the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus? Is this ever the case in anything else? *Life* is not like leaven. There is no growth in leaven; there is no preserving or conserving or restorative power in it. All it can do is to *spread*, and to make the substance through which it spreads a decaying, putrefying thing. Can such a substance be rightly used either as an emblem of the triumphs of divine grace in the soul, or of the victories of

UMI

truth in the world? Yet in sermons, in books, in missionary speeches, and in popular hymns, how constantly is this term used as an illustration of the progress of truth and holiness! How much of the popular expectation of a millennium to be gradually introduced by human instrumentality during the present dispensation, which has already so fearfully failed through man's unfaithfulness, is founded on a misinterpretation of this parable of our Lord!

But here an objection naturally arises. Was not leaven used very generally in preparing the bread upon which the Jews mainly subsisted? Can that, then, which was thus generally eaten be really an emblem of evil? It might be sufficient for us again to point to the various passages already cited, and ask, Is it not *thus used* by our Lord and his apostles? Who can deny this? We might also observe that leaven, though so commonly used, was not necessary to make nourishing bread. Life could be very well sustained on unleavened bread. It was not perhaps so palatable, but it was as wholesome. Leaven added *nothing* to the nutritiousness of the meal or flour. Every one knows that in our day a plan has been devised to make bread without yeast, leaven, or any fermenting substance; and that many think it the most wholesome. But the true answer to the objection is, that our Lord speaks of *meal* or dough before it becomes bread by the usual process. If, when meal or flour is leavened or fermented in any way, it is left in that state too long, it is soon totally unfit for use; and if suffered to remain thus, it becomes altogether corrupt and full of worms. When leaven was put into meal, and the mass had fermented, the action of fire was necessary to guide and check the process, thus preventing corruption, and making the leavened article suitable for food. Every housewife knows that if she puts yeast into her flour, and mixes both together, she must be careful not to let the dough remain beyond a certain time out of the oven, else all will be spoiled, or, at the best, make very "heavy bread." She knows also that if it were left for a few days, it would become sour and full of corruption.

Now we have thought that our Lord's parable only takes the former part of the process, and does not carry the thoughts on to the bread as fit for food. Nor is it clear to us that the parable is intended to make use of the *woman* as a symbol any more than in Luke 15: 8, or to present her as personifying the Church giving out bad food instead of good. It may perhaps be proper to carry on the illustration to other things, but the chief, if not the *only lesson* taught by our Lord, we think, is, that as leaven put into meal would pervade and assimilate it to its own nature, so evil doctrines and practices introduced very early into the professing church would spread and spread until the system called Christianity was full of the evil, resulting at last in utter apostasy. Again, we ask, is it not an historical fact that evil did thus spread? Do not the huge, unsightly systems of western and

eastern Christianity *now* exhibit this parable *thus* fulfilled? Has not Christendom, as a whole, become a corrupt thing? The good found amidst all this evil is the result of God's sovereign election (Acts 15: 14; 2 Thess. 2: 13), and not the result of the spreading out of nominal Christianity as patronized by the powers of earth. And the terrible ending is yet to come.

But it may be objected further, that though the parable of "the sower," of "the wheat and tares," of "the good and bad fishes," speak of the triumph of evil as well as the victories of grace, yet the parable of "the mustard-seed," preceding that of "the leaven," certainly speaks of the triumph of good, of the gradual growth of religion in beauty and beneficialness. To this we answer, that the first parable, respecting "the sower and the seed," clearly declares that Divine truth during this dispensation only takes real effect in a minority of cases; as here stated, it is only one out of four. That the parable of "the wheat and the tares," and of "the net and fishes," both embrace the whole of the dispensation down *to the end*. It follows, then, that if these three parables speak of failure and corruption, and of the triumph of evil generally *all through the dispensation*, surely another parable uttered at the same time, and almost in the same breath, cannot teach something *quite opposite*. The parable of "the wheat and tares," and that of "the mustard-seed," cannot contradict each other; the parable of the "leaven," and that of "the sower," cannot run side by side chronologically, and yet one teach general failure and the other gradual success; one cannot teach only very partial conversion previous to Christ's coming, and the other gradual universal conversion *before* that great event.

We believe the fact to be that the parable of "the mustard-seed" is similar in its teachings to that of "the leaven." It sets forth, indeed, growth, but such growth as is not of God, though clearly *foretold* by Christ. A tree fed from the earth, waxing great, and harboring the fowls of heaven in its branches, had, many ages before this parable was spoken, been used as an emblem of the *growth* of worldly greatness: "The tree that thou sawest, which grew, and was strong, whose hight reached unto the heaven, and the sight thereof to all the earth; whose leaves were fair, and the fruit thereof much, and in it was meat for all; under which the beasts of the field dwelt, and upon whose branches the fowls of the heaven had their habitation: it is thou, O king, that art grown and become strong: for thy greatness is grown, and reacheth unto heaven, and thy dominion to the end of the earth." (Dan. 4: 20–22.) Let the reader compare this passage with our Lord's parable, and mark the agreement between the two descriptions.

But it may be said, is not a tree an invariable emblem of spiritual prosperity? Does not Ps. 1: 3 and Jer. 17: 8 teach this? That a fruit-bearing tree *is* generally used as an emblem of true

believers we gladly admit; but then a tree is used in Scripture as an emblem of evil men as well as of good. "I have seen the wicked in great power, and spreading like a green bay-tree." (Ps. 37: 36, 37; see also Ezek. 17, and call again to mind the stately tree which was a symbol of Babylon's proud and presumtuous monarch.) In looking at scripture symbols, it should be borne in mind that the same thing has often a two-fold aspect. *Water*, for instance, is a symbol of both death and life; *rivers* set forth destructive agencies and rich blessings. Christ is compared to a *lion;* so also is Satan. Many more illustrations might be given, and among them that of a tree or plant. We therefore conclude that the mustard-seed, and the leaven, the growth of the one, and the assimilative power of the other, both set forth the progress of evil, and how the professing church became a receptacle for the world.

The question which we have endeavored to answer we have called *a question for the times;* and we have done so because the times in which we live are times of *special activity*. This cannot be denied. Much activity is displayed among true Christians for the spread of God's word, and for the triumph of the saving truths of Christianity; while equal, if not greater earnestness is found among those who contradict its first principles, and who wish to introduce another gospel. It becomes us then to ask, Does the word of God speak decidedly and plainly as to the result of these evil activities under *the present dispensation?* That truth will ultimately triumph in the world, that good will overcome evil, and that "the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the Lord," we have not the slightest doubt. But the question is, Will it be in this dispensation, and before the Lord returns? *We believe not.* We find no promise in the word of God of a millennium before the Lord's second coming. We never find apostles cheering each other on in the manner Christians do now; on the contrary, all the sacred writers, *without exception*, foretell the early corruption of Christianity, the evil course of Christendom, and its fearful end in apostasy and judgment. But amidst all this failure, God is carrying out his own purposes of love, and forming a people for his praise. "His counsel shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure."

It is most desirable that our *hopes* on this important point should be scriptural, because our hopes will *influence our conduct*. While gratefully acknowledging that much good has been done, and that many who have labored, and are still laboring in hope of converting all the world, have been holy men, sincerely devoted to God and truth; we can but conclude that the popular hope of converting all the world has not unfrequently led to a course of action calculated to defeat the very end which is aimed at.

To *convert*—really to *convert*—the fallen soul of man is one thing: to spread a profession of Christianity is another. Is not

the professing church "spreading out," instead of *gathering* in? Is there not frequently a diluting of Christianity to suit the world's tastes? and are not professors of Christianity adopting worldly habits, tastes, and fashions to an alarming extent, and at a fearfully growing rate? There is a rage for numbers that is unwholesome; churches must increase; numbers must be gained at any rate. *The American Baptist* a short time ago observed: "The church is going downward to meet the world, and the world is coming upward to meet the church. This, it seems to us, is the characteristic of our times, and never more distinctly seen than in the history of the past year."

We could give many illustrations of the truth of these charges. There is an acknowledgment of these sad facts in many quarters; and who, indeed, can deny them? Growing wealth, increasing worldliness, a sensational literature greedily read by numbers of professing Christians; tawdry splendor and musical performances where simplicity of worship once prevailed, with many apologies for trifling amusements, once deemed altogether incompatible with spiritual Christianity; are among the signs of the times which, along with much unsound doctrine, show that the leaven of evil is working powerfully even among us. So far from the Church converting the world to God, there is reason to fear that the world is in some things fast converting the Church to itself by stamping its own image more and more upon it. God loves reality and truth in religion, and not size and splendor. Who that considers the scripture character of God can possibly believe that the HOLY and ALL-SEEING ONE can look with any pleasure on the past history of Christendom, or on much that is now going on among us? Prophetic utterances, and the Lord's testimony concerning the religion which he saw when on earth, forbid such a thought. It may be that the Lord may bring some fire of chastisement to check its progress, and to separate a people for himself, who shall lift up the banner of his truth in "the last days and perilous times," which we think are not far off.

If these things are so, and if such is the testimony of God's word, small reason is there indeed to sing, as is now generally done—

> "The little seed from heaven
> Shall soon become a tree;
> The *ever-blessed leaven*
> Diffused abroad must be:
> Till God the Son return again,
> It must go on. Amen, amen!"

"*It* must go on;" yes *it* must. But *what?* Tares and wheat growing together *until* the harvest. "The net gathering fishes good and bad." "The mystery of iniquity working until Christ comes." All this *must go on.* And so we rejoice to think that the calling out of God's chosen must go on till his purposes of love are accomplished. It is not we, or any mere men, who say

UMI

all this; neither "do we desire the woful day" of retribution on Christendom. We *would* be prophets *of peace*, like others, if we dared. So would Jeremiah have liked to have been; but he could not join the other prophets, because his heart "stood in awe of what the Lord had spoken." (Jer. 28: 6; 29: 8.) It was like "a burning fire within him."

Surely, with God's testimony concerning "leaven" before us, and with the history of Christendom, and a predicted apostasy as a comment on the Lord's parables in Matt. 13, and his prophecies in Matt. 24; for Christians to sing as they do when they use the above well-known verse, is to err very seriously from the truth. If to call "leaven," thus branded by God as evil, "*ever-blessed*," is not "calling evil good," it is something very much like it. Surely it is dangerous to do this. It is a sad sign to see so many glory in it.

"Behold, a sower went forth to sow." Such are the emphatic words with which the Lord begins the series of parables in Matt. 13. Christ was the great sower, and his apostles followed in his path. Sowing, ever sowing, should be the motto of those who are saved. Scattering truth in order to save souls should be our great business. Sow, and expect God's blessing; sow in tears, and hope to reap in joy; sow, and listen attentively to God's prophecies; but let us utter none of our own, and eschew any human theory or system which weakens our sympathy with God, or hinders our conformity to Christ as regards exertions or expectations.

The Lord Jesus often, during his ministry, announced with sorrow and tears the coming doom of Israel; and yet, in all his doings and directions, he sought to save and bless them. (John 5: 34; Luke 24: 47; Acts 3: 26.) The apostle Paul, while declaring the rejection of Israel, sought by all means to save some. (Rom. 10: 1; 11: 14; 1 Cor. 10: 33.) God's precepts, and not his purposes, must regulate our conduct; but his sure word of prophecy, and not human predictions and calculations, must *regulate our expectations.* Mr. Craik has well said: "The moment any doctrine so operates as to make us little in earnest about souls, either the doctrine is false, or we are perverting it. Rather I will then be a fool for Christ's sake; I will labor and pray as if all might be saved; and if any are brought to God, I will give all the glory to sovereign and distinguishing grace."—*Sel.*

It becomes the All-wise God and not mortal man to be unchangeable. It doth not belong to such poor, imperfect beings as we are to remain forever unmovable in all the same opinions that we have once indulged, nor stamp every sentiment with immortality. For a man to be obstinately tenacious of an old mistake, and incorrigibly fond of any obscure phrase or conception because he has once admitted it is the shame and not the glory of human nature.— *Watts.*

THE STUMBLING-BLOCK.

By the Rev. SAMUEL MINTON, London, Eng.

"Thou shalt not put a stumbling-block before the blind." (Lev. 19: 14.)

I. Being blind, he is not unlikely to stumble, whether we do or not; but that is no excuse for our putting a stumbling-block in his way. This is what has been done to the spiritually blind by the doctrine of eternal evil. It is not only destitute of any solid foundation in scripture, but is directly opposed to its plainest teaching; and we now proceed to point out some of the injurious results which flow from its adoption.

First and foremost, it begets more positive infidelity than perhaps all other causes put together. Men are told that the doctrine of endless suffering rests on precisely the same authority as the gospel; that the one is as plainly taught in God's word as the other; and that if they deny one they have no ground for believing the other. The few texts that sound very much like it have been drilled into them from childhood; so that, when they begin to reflect, and find the doctrine absolutely incredible, it never occurs to them that these passages may possibly admit of another interpretation, and they therefore reject the whole Bible together. We are far from saying that they are guiltless in so doing; but the measure of their guilt can be estimated by God alone. Even we may see a marked difference between one case and another, from the half-reluctant abandonment of traditional belief to the contemptuous sneer or malignant scowl with which it is denied and defied. But God alone can know how far they have willfully shut their eyes against the light, and been only too glad of an excuse for getting rid of the Bible, because it testified of them that their deeds were evil. In no case can the Church be excused for the perverse obstinacy with which she has tied this millstone about the neck of inspiration, clinging to it as if it were a fundamental part of the gospel itself, harping on those few texts that sound like it to a carefully attuned ear, and using them as a lever to turn upside down the whole teaching of scripture on the subject to which they refer, making it mean something totally different from what it says. Neither can any one, whose eyes have been graciously opened

to see the delusion, be absolved from a grave dereliction of duty, unless he does his utmost to rid Christianity of such an incubus, and remove such a stumbling-block out of the way of the blind. Let those who can "lift up their voice like a trumpet," and let those who cannot, at least add a hearty amen.

Even this, however, is not the worst evil. To adopt positive infidelity requires more determination of character than most people possess. For one who is driven into that position by the popular teaching, perhaps twenty are lulled by it into a fatal slumber. Of all the delusions that prevail about this subject, none can exceed that which supposes the doctrine of endless suffering to be a powerful instrument for awakening sinners to a sense of their danger. The deterring effect of punishment depends far more upon its certainty than upon its severity. Now, the excessive severity of the punishment thus threatened, not only robs it of all certainty whatever, but makes almost every one feel certain that, in his own case at all events, it will never be inflicted. And when he is assured that the only alternative before him is, at the moment of death, to enter at once into a state of endless happiness or endless wo, he feels so perfectly sure that he neither does, nor ever can, deserve the latter, that his future entrance into bliss becomes to him a matter of course. He may be quite aware that he is not fit for it yet, or even on the road to it: but in some way or other it must come all right at the last. And he is confirmed in this by observing, that in spite of the general professed belief in the saying, "strait is the gate, and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it," almost every separate individual, after his decease, is supposed by his friends to have entered into bliss. Few persons, in their last hours, refuse to receive a minister of religion; nearly all profess repentance and faith; and when the only known alternative for the survivors is to believe them to be in endless bliss or in endless torment, how can it be otherwise than that every one, except in the extremest cases, should be supposed to have entered into life? And how can this fail to make the survivors themselves expect that their own latter end will be like theirs? Thus the law is virtually robbed of its terrors, and the thunders of Sinai reduced to "sound and fury signifying nothing."

Even a worse evil perhaps yet remains, in the tendency of this theory to diminish the saving power of the Gospel. That

power is love. "We love him, because he first loved us;" and "hereby we perceive his love, because he laid down his life for us." Therefore, whatever clouds the revelation of God's love that is made to us in the Gospel, must lessen its power to save and sanctify us. And what can possibly throw a darker shadow over it, than to combine with its glorious message such a hideous doctrine as this? How can we be drawn to love an almighty Being, who will keep millions of his own creatures alive forever, in order that they may endure unceasing, endless agony? We may feel something that we call gratitude or thankfulness, which can be little more than a sense of relief, to think that we are not amongst them; but how can that alter our view of his character? Not in the least. That the Gospel, even with this tremendous hindrance in its way, should actually have saved such a multitude of souls, only shows what a marvelous weapon it is, and how the Spirit of God can enable it to overcome almost any amount of poison, that the craft of Satan, or the infirmity of man, may mingle with it.

If it be said that the same objection would apply to the scripture doctrine of everlasting destruction, we entirely deny it. As no creature has any right to live at all, it would be perfectly consistent with infinite love for the Creator to terminate its life whenever he pleased; even apart from the consideration of the condemned having willfully rejected the eternal life offered them in Christ. And as to the specific punishment previously inflicted upon them for their own particular sins, that is perfectly in accordance with one of the deepest moral instincts that God has implanted within our breast, namely: that there *ought* to be retribution for wrong doing unrepented of. So long as we are sure that the retribution will not exceed what the wrong doing actually deserves, it need not in the least degree lessen our confidence in God's righteous love. What amount of punishment any one's sins do deserve, we cannot tell. All we know with absolute certainty is, that by no possibility can they deserve *infinite* punishment. So long as there is a limit to the number of stripes, we can confidently leave God to pronounce how many or how few they should be. Scripture distinctly assigns a limit to them, by assuring us, in every variety of language, that they will end, sooner or later, in the utter destruction of the lost soul. And therefore scripture throws no cloud at all over the proof which the Gospel affords of God's amazing love, in having given his

UMI

only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

Another evil resulting from this theory is, that it aggravates the enmity of the world against those who are chosen out of it. That enmity, in a more or less developed form, is unavoidable, from the very nature of the case. But that is no excuse for our needlessly provoking it. On the contrary, we should do all in our power to conciliate them, "giving no offence in anything." A believing wife is enjoined to behave toward her unbelieving husband in such a way that he may be "won" by it. Now could anything be conceived more calculated to exasperate them, nay, to excite a feeling of righteous indignation within them, than the knowledge that we consider them so unutterably bad as to deserve endless torment? No words can describe the abhorence with which we ought to regard them, if we really believe this. It is nothing to say that we hope they may repent. That may so far mitigate the horror with which we think of the prospect before them, as to prevent our heart breaking, or our brain giving way, though it seems a mystery how we can eat or sleep, knowing that any moment their doom may become inevitable. But that does not in the least affect our estimate of their present character. Our theory compels us to regard them at present as all but infinitely wicked. For though we may admit degrees in the severity of the punishment, yet the endlessness of it almost reduces the difference to insignificance. Neither can we escape from this by reference to the fuller development of the evil principles within them, when the restraints of this present life are removed, and the Spirit wholly ceases to strive with them. For, however true that may be, it must be by their conduct during this state of probation that they have incurred the penalty of being hopelessly consigned to such a condition. So that it comes practically to the same thing. Now, however bad they may be, so bad that they cannot even themselves dream of being on the narrow road to life, yet their deepest instincts assure them that they cannot possibly have incurred *such* guilt as to deserve infinite punishment. They therefore resent, consciously or unconsciously, the unmeasured imputation which our theory casts upon them. And the only thing which makes them tolerate us at all is the knowledge that it is a mere theory, and that our feelings toward them are totally different; in which confidence they are of course greatly aided by knowing that we regard ourselves to have been in the same condition, until we became new creatures in Christ Jesus.

An imaginary case will perhaps put the matter in a clearer light than any argument about the abstract principle. Suppose a model husband, who is a thorough worldling, has a model wife, who is a decided Christian. He knows her theory to be, that if he were to die now, he would enter into a state of hopeless eternal misery; and as God cannot possibly inflict upon any one severer punishment than he deserves, as he has declared that whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap, she must believe his guilt to be enormous beyond all power of conception. She hopes that he will yet repent of it, and be saved; but she knows that she may awake any morning, and find that his everlasting agonies, of mind at least, have actually commenced, and all hope of their ever being mitigated or brought to an end utterly gone. Further, so certain is she that this tremendous doom, on whomsoever it may fall, is not one whit more than he deserves, that the continuance of it, in ever-increasing intensity, is part of the permanent ultimate prospect, the hope of which cheers her under all the trials of this mortal life, and makes her rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory. She cannot, it is true, as yet derive any conscious satisfaction from thinking that the smoke of his torment will ascend forever and ever, but she believes that she will do so, when she gets into a right state of mind; inasmuch as whatever conduces to the glory of God must conduce to the happiness of all whose minds are in harmony with his. And what at first sight seems to make the matter worse, is that she is so wonderfully happy under this state of things. Not only can she enter with apparent zest and enjoyment into a variety of innocent pleasures, perhaps appreciate humor, have no objection to a little quiet merry-making, and rather like a moderate amount of society; but even in her religious exercises, which ought to overwhelm her with gloom or plunge her into despair, she endeavors to assume as joyful tone as possible. The most wonderful thing is to see her at the piano, and hear her sing the most charming hymns of joy and hope, about the glorious prospect of eternal holiness and happiness that is set before us—with her husband in the room, whose eternal agonies are perhaps to form part of the dark background on which the glories of heaven are to stand out so brightly. Hark!

UMI

"There is a land of pure delight,
Where saints immortal reign,
Infinite day excludes the night,"

(to *him* it will be, infinite night excludes the day)—

"And pleasures banish pain"—

that is, from *them;* the pain being all concentrated elsewhere.

How do these two manage to live so comfortably together? The answer is suggested by what we have just been saying. He knows that this theory has no place in her heart and soul, but merely lies on the surface of her brain. And if she would reflect a moment, she would see it herself. Her *feeling* is not how bad he is, but how good he is. She never tires of praising him as a pattern of every virtue under heaven. And what does often make her sad, is the melancholy thought that such a man should be living only for the perishing things of this passing life, and sacrificing his prospect of glory and honor and immortality by refusing to lay hold on the eternal life offered him in Christ. All that she sees in him to love and admire makes her realize more deeply his capability of something higher and better, and she sometimes cannot help weeping to think how he will himself be filled with shame, and what an object of everlasting contempt he will become to the universe, for having sacrificed the substance to the shadow, and sold his glorious inheritance for a contemptible mess of pottage; for having fallen into a net that was spread before his very eyes, snatched at Satan's bait, though the barbed point of the deadly hook was actually protruding out of it, sown to the flesh when he was told that he could only reap corruption from it, chosen the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, whether in the form of sensual indulgence, intellectual gratification, or any earthly distinction, rather than to wear an imperishable crown, to possess a kingdom that cannot be moved, to secure the reversion of an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away; to sit with Christ on his throne, and share in the government of the universe. All this is put before him in scripture again and again. Human language is exhausted, and all human things ransacked for metaphors, to fire his ambition, and make him resolve, at any cost or any effort, to obtain such a prize, to lay hold on eternal life. But his answer is, No, it is too much trouble; let me eat and drink, and have others to eat and drink with me, and to-morrow I am willing to die. This, no doubt, makes her often weep and always pray. It is not the greater or less number of stripes he may receive that troubles her so much; it is the thought that he is throwing himself away, that by and by he will be cut down like the grass, and wither as the green herb, and that one who might have been an heir of immortality will soon be amongst the things of the past; at length, perhaps forgotten by all except the Infinite mind that can never forget anything. This is quite sufficient trial for her. But heavy as the burden sometimes is, it is nothing to the unutterable anguish that would crush her to the earth, if she really felt in her inmost soul, that he actually deserved, and might any moment be plunged into, eternal torment.

No, it is a hideous dream, for which the devil, and not the Bible, is responsible. And those whom God has been gracious enough to awaken out of it should show their gratitude by using every effort to awaken others, so that they may bask in the light and warmth of the Sun of righteousness, and know what it is to be able to believe that God is love; feeling it no exaggeration to say—

"Could we with ink the ocean fill,
Were the whole sky of parchment made,
Were every blade of grass a quill,
And every man a scribe by trade;
To tell the love
Of God above
Would drain the ocean dry,
Nor would the scroll
Contain the whole,
Though stretched from sky to sky."

"Take up the stumbling-block out of the way of my people." (Is. 57: 14.)

II. Being God's people, they will not "stumble that they should fall;" but they may receive grievous injury, notwithstanding, from striking their foot against a stumbling-block. And such injury has the Church undoubtedly received from the doctrine of eternal evil. Let us see how it affects those who have been called out of the world, and received the gift of eternal life, through faith in Christ Jesus.

Perhaps its worst effect is that it must necessarily, to whatever extent it is realized, cloud their view of God's love. They cannot get rid of an uneasy feeling, though hardly perhaps aware of it, which prevents their looking up to him with entire confidence

and perfect love. That even our God is "a consuming" fire to sin, and therefore to impenitent sinners, rather helps, than hinders, us to confide in and love him; for it assures us that sooner or later there will be an end of evil, and the whole universe become "very good." But if there is to be no end to it, if God is not to be a consuming fire, but only a torturing fire, in which those who may be exposed to it are to be kept alive forever, so as never to be put out of their misery, then a perpetual effort must be made to forget all this, if we are to feel any confidence whatever in our Father's love. But we pass on to what is not quite so palpable, but which has a more powerful influence than is commonly supposed.

The popular doctrine reduces to a minimum the grace of Christ in dying for us. People strangely talk as if the depth of misery from which we have been rescued was a measure of Christ's self-sacrificing love in coming to our rescue. Surely it leans all on the other side. The same amount of sacrifice, that I might think very great for any one to make, in order to save me from a small punishment, might appear nothing, if made in order to save me from a very heavy one. A Christian man once told me how much distressed he was, at not being able altogether to get rid of a feeling, that it would have been rather hard, if we had been just left under condemnation, and nothing been done to save us from it. No wonder! The marvel is that such thoughts do not press so continually upon the minds of all men, as to make them search and see what it is that lies at the bottom of them, or at least constitutes their sting. If we are all born in such a condition, as without help would render it practically inevitable that we should spend an eternity in misery, it is *not* easy to think very much of the grace that was willing to make even such a sacrifice as has been made, to deliver us from such a doom. As another believer once said to me, "Who would not do it?" But embrace the teaching of scripture and the whole aspect of the case is altered. For from what does Christ save us?

In the first place, from non-existence. But for Christ, Adam would have died the day he sinned, and you, of course, would never have existed. Would that have been at all hard upon you? What right have you to exist at all? None whatever. And you are indebted for your existence to the provisions made in the everlasting covenant of grace, which was to be sealed with the blood of Jesus Christ. Is not that free grace?

In the next place you are saved from that death which is the wages of sin, and which would be inflicted upon you at once, but for the intercession of Christ. You are saved from the penalty of Adam's sin, in that you came into existence; you are at present saved from the penalty of your own sin, in that you continue to exist for a moment after committing it; death being the natural wages of sin. And in these two ways Christ is absolutely "the Savior of all men" alike; he "gave his flesh for the life of the world;" and in him "God reconciled the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." The life of the world was forfeited in Adam, and freely given back in Christ. Every one who lives long enough to know God's will, has forfeited his own life by not submitting to it. The infliction of that penalty is suspended, and far more than the remission of it freely offered to those who are willing to accept it through Christ. If they refuse it, they commit a worse sin than Adam's, and incur a heavier doom, a more fearful death. For them "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and of fiery indignation, that shall devour [not keep alive in torture, but *devour*] the adversaries." What is there "hard" in this? Nothing whatever. We have only to clear away this horrible fiction of eternal suffering, and then we see in its true light the wondrous "grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might become rich;" we can to some extent appreciate that love, which God commends to us, "in that when we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

Another loss which the Christian sustains through the belief of this unscriptural doctrine, arises from the difficulty it interposes in the way of his cultivating that highest of all Christian graces—"joyfulness." Again and again is he urged to "rejoice evermore," again and again is he told that "joy and peace in believing" are among the fruits of the Spirit. Now the main element of joy is hope. Peace comes from a sense of present reconciliation; but real joy can only be produced by the prospect of what is to come. "We *rejoice* in *hope* of the glory of God." But how is it possible to rejoice in a prospect that includes the endless sufferings of millions of our fellow-creatures? It would be simply impossible, but for that happy, though not blameless, inconsistency between our opinions and our feelings, that we have so often had occasion to notice. What is it you are so earnestly longing for? Is it for your own individual happiness only? Far from it; you are not so selfish. You are longing for the groans of creation to cease, for sin and suffering to be at an end. Some terrible act of wickedness shocks you, some heart-breaking tale of wo makes you weep in sympathy, and you say, Ah, well, it will soon be over; this is not to go on forever, it is "but for a moment," and then all will be peace and holiness and joy; "creation itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corrup-

UMI

tion into the glorious liberty of the children of God." What are you talking about? Do you ever think what you are saying? Sin and suffering at an end! Why, it will be multiplied a hundred-fold. No enmity against God that is now felt by the most hardened sinner in the world, can compare with the intense hatred of him that must be felt by those who are writhing under his hand in hopeless agony; whom he will neither allow to die, nor cease to torment. Nor can all the groans that have ever been wrung from creation approach the unutterable anguish of an eternal hell. What is it, that all the sin and suffering will be transferred to another globe, or buried within the center of this? It will exist, and exist forever. And this is part of the glorious future you are hoping for, and praying for, and the thought of which is to make you "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory!" Happily you are able generally to keep it out of your mind, and think only of the bright side; but your efforts can be only partially successful; and I believe that this terrible phantom does more than all other causes put together, to damp Christian joy, and render it all but impossible heartily to rejoice. The present often looks far too dark to rejoice in, and you are almost afraid to think of the future, for there starts up an apparition of something darker still. The result is a degree of gloominess, and cheerlessness, a want of buoyancy and elasticity, that constitutes a hindrance to yourself and a stumbling-block to others. It impedes your running in the race, paralyzes your arm in the battle, and mars the attractive grace, with which you should seek to "adorn the doctrine of God your Savior."

Again, this doctrine tends to produce an injurious effect on the state of our minds toward the world around us; because it all but abolishes any moral superiority of one man over another, and makes the apostolic teaching that there is "no difference" as regards their all having "come short of the glory of God," to mean that one is as bad as another. You admit, no doubt, in words, and certainly feel, that there is a very great difference between them. But your theory reduces it almost to nothing. For if all deserve endless suffering, the difference between the intensity of the suffering in one case or another is hardly appreciable to us. The fact of its being hopeless and endless is so overwhelming to the mind, that everything else sinks into insignificance. You are therefore obliged to do violence to your moral instincts by making an effort on principle to think as badly as possible of those whom, when off your guard, you would call the best of them. You are afraid to give them any credit at all, lest you should thereby be under-estimating the exceeding sinfulness of sin. For if the smallest sin deserves endless suffering, it must be practically impossible to think too badly of any sinner. But on the other hand, if the wages of sin is death, if sin—that is, separation from God—renders it impossible for any moral creature permanently to live, if life is drawn from God, and can only be sustained by union with God, so that without God any creature must necessarily perish, then, in the amount of punishment that may be inflicted in the process of his death, in the greater or less severity of his dying agonies, there is abundant room for all the difference that our moral instincts require between the most opposite extremes of human character, to be found amongst those who are out of Christ.

Lastly, we may observe, that it injures their moral sense, by the inevitable discord which it creates between their opinions and their feelings. It would be a still worse evil, if they really felt as they profess to believe—and we have at every step to give them credit for this; but still they cannot do such violence as this theory requires, to the harmony that ought to subsist between the mind and the heart, without throwing a shade of unreality over the whole of their inner being—and, we must add, casting doubt upon the sincerity of all their religious convictions, in the eyes of the world around them. Why do they not go mad at the sight of such multitudes rushing into endless wo? Or, if faith have such enormous power as to save them from that, why do they not put on sackcloth and ashes, cover their faces, and wail with a bitter lamentation? Why do they not rush frantically about the streets, stop every one they meet, and, with horror and dismay depicted upon their countenances, warn them of the unutterable wo that lies before them? Why do they ever let a smile play upon their features? How can they eat and drink and sleep amidst such a scene of horror? They know that a human being dies nearly every second—they believe that only a small fraction of them are saved; and yet they go on, laughing and singing, buying and selling, building and planting, marrying and giving in marriage, just as if it was all a myth. They rejoice at the birth of a probable inheritor of this tremendous doom; and make merry at a wedding, which may probably add thousands to the wretched inhabitants of that eternal prison-house. Are you about to marry? Stop and think! You may have children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren; your descendants may go on multiplying, generation after generation. You know that but few are saved, and, whatever confidence you have about your own children, it must grow less and less about every successive generation; so that the ultimate result of the step you are about to take, will probably be the addition of a few to the number of the blessed, of many to the number of the lost—the intensity and the duration of the happiness or misery of each being the same. Dare you take the step? What! face an eternity, spent in the knowledge that thousands of your own descendants are mingling, with their frantic curses against God for creating them, scarcely less bitter curses against you, for having been the willing instrument of bringing them into existence, for the horrible selfishness of having, merely to gratify yourself taken a step that you knew might at least lead to such a result! And if you *are* prepared to encounter even this, do you expect to find any minister of religion, that believes in an

eternal hell, who will dare to join you in wedlock? "No!" he would say, "the service I should have to use would be a horrible mockery, and the thought of it would haunt me to my dying hour; I should be helping you to commit a crime of the deepest dye, and myself be a partaker of the sin. Find some one who believes that evil is limited, but good unlimited; that life may continue forever, but that death *cannot;* that heaven is a place to live in, and hell a place to die in—and *he* may bless your marriage. For if it sends a thousand to hell, and only one to heaven, the gain would then be so incalculably greater than the loss, that there would be scarcely an appreciable drawback to the satisfaction with which the proceeding might be regarded—the unlimited happiness of one of course infinitely outweighing any possible amount of unlimited misery. But don't ask *me* to do it; my tongue would cleave to the roof of my mouth, and a horrible dread would overwhelm me."[1] What more need we say? Could the force of inconsistency go further than this? How can the world believe that we mean what we say, and that there is any sincerity whatever in our professed convictions?

Surely our Great Enemy well knew what he was about, when he succeeded in inducing the Church to accept this monstrous perversion of God's word. She was led astray unwittingly; and millions of saints are now adoring the grace that pardoned, and to such a great extent neutralized the effect of, the very worst error that was ever engrafted upon the truth. But Satan was not deceived. Again has he tried, only too successfully, his old lie, in a different meaning, but from the same willful enmity against God—"Thou shalt not surely die." His main object was the same in both cases, namely: to persuade man that sin would bring no penalty at all. At first he did it by a direct assurance of impunity, and then afterwards by putting before him as the only alternative, either eternal happiness, or something that no one, in his own case at least, could ever believe possible. And really, if we could admit the possibility of eternal evil; if we could believe that anything might provoke God to inflict infinite punishment upon a finite creature; if we could ever imagine him unwilling to let an enemy escape out of his hands, even by annihilating him—it would be the case of that dark spirit of evil, who has willfully led multitudes of God's dear children to believe their Heavenly Father *capable* of what this doctrine attributes to him.

But no! Scripture assures us that the devil and his works are to be destroyed together—the long conflict between good and evil will end in the consuming fire of hell—evil will be a thing of the past—all things will be reconciled to God through Jesus Christ, so that he himself may be all in all.

Amen! Even so, Lord Jesus, come quickly!

[1] Had not such remarks been misunderstood, I should scarcely think it necessary to explain that it is simple irony, intended to show the doctrine in its true colors, by pointing out what *ought* to be the feeling and conduct of one who really believes it.

THE WITCH OF ENDOR.[1]

Saul, by his repeated, willful transgressions of the express commands of God; by his rebellion, manifested in such forms that it was as bad as the sin of witchcraft perpetrated in favor of idolatry; by his envious, malignant, and impious persecution of David, though known and acknowledged by him to be the Lord's anointed, had reduced himself to the most deplorable situation. The determined and deadly enemies of his person and kingdom had assembled in vast numbers; so that though he was evidently a man of great natural courage and resolution, as he demonstrated by his conduct in the most hopeless situation, "he was afraid, and his heart trembled," and his whole army participated in his fears. In this extremity he betook himself to God, not as an humble penitent, to solicit the pardon of his sins, prepared to accept of the punishment of his iniquity, and to wait on the Lord, even if he should hide himself from him—no, but to make an experiment, whether he could obtain from God the information and assistance he needed, but determined if he could not succeed with heaven, to have recourse to hell. Accordingly, when, as he was regarding iniquity in his heart, God would not hear him, would not answer him, "neither by Urim, nor by prophets," he betook himself to a reputed witch. This he did, though he well knew the utter unlawfulness of this practice in all its forms, and that it was most offensive to the God of heaven; nay, though he had himself, a short time before, in a fit of selfish or ostentatious devotion, "put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land;" perhaps wishing either to pacify his conscience, and to appease the offended majesty of heaven, or to be able to say, "Come and see my zeal for the Lord of hosts; I am as religious as David, though God has rejected me and chosen him." In answer to Saul's inquiries, and in obedience to his commands, his servants told him, "Behold, there is a woman that hath a familiar spirit at Endor;" and to her he immediately applied. Now the question is, Was this woman a witch in the ordinary sense of the word? Had she any intercourse with evil spirits? Did they bring up Samuel for her, or personate him, so that she thought he was brought up from the dead, or from the invisible world? Or did God work a miracle, and cause Samuel to appear? Or was she an impostor? Did she deceive Saul by her crafty, false pretenses? I am strongly inclined to believe, nay, I have little doubt, that the

[1] This article is from the pen of Walter Scott, a Congregationalist divine of England. Writing from the orthodox stand-point, his testimony on this remarkable imposture is the more valuable. It cannot be said that his theory of the state of the dead drove him to his conclusions, but, rather, his convictions were the result of a candid examination of the evidence in the case.—ED. QUAR.

UMI

latter hypothesis is correct, and that it will enable us to account for all the particulars of the narration.

The word *ob*, in this case translated "familiar spirits," might be translated, a ventriloquist; and it seems most naturally to signify one who, by ventriloquism, acts the part of a necromancer. As far then as the original word is concerned, the probability is, that she had no power over evil spirits, but that she was a base deceiver, or a miserable enthusiast, or both. And that she was to a great extent an imposter, surely all must grant. For what did she undertake and profess? When Saul said to her, "Divine for me by the familiar spirit, and bring me him up whom I shall name unto thee," her answer was, "Whom shall I bring up unto thee?" Now was not this equivalent to a profession that she could bring up any one whom he might name, and, consequently, that she had power over all the regions of the dead; and that she could at her pleasure, and by the efficacy of her charms, either raise bodies from the grave, or bring spirits from the invisible world? It would be mere trifling to expose the absurdity of such pretensions, and to prove that she was so far a gross imposter, and claimed a power which belongs exclusively to God. To raise the dead is the work of omnipotence. Jesus Christ has, and always had, "the keys of *hades* and of death;" their gates "he opens, and none can shut; he shuts, and none can open:" and who can suppose that he would entrust them for a moment to a witch, and to an evil spirit, even if they had power to bear and turn them? So far, then, her pretenses were as false as they were impious. And if it be said, but Satan, or her familiar spirit, might appear in the form of the person whom she was requested to bring up, and speak and act in his name; we reply, this is not asserted or even implied in the narrative. She might assert that she saw persons ascending out of the ground, describe their appearance, pretend to talk with them, and by the art of ventriloquism cause those for whom she was divining to believe that they talked with her and she with them, while nothing of the kind took place in reality. Nay, if her imagination was warm and morbid, her judgment weak, and her health unsound; if she was the subject of mental aberration, and of a superstitious belief in the power of charms, she might when practising her incantations actually believe that spirits had appeared at her command, that she saw what had no existence, and heard what was never uttered. Imagination has performed far greater wonders, and caused far grosser delusions, than are implied in what has now been supposed.

And if we examine the narrative, I apprehend we shall find nothing in it for which we may not account on the supposition that she was an imposter, who practised her art, and made high pretenses, for the sake of admiration and gain, to what she did not possess. Let it be observed that she was a professed necromancer or sorceress, and consequently was skilled in all the arts of deception connected with that profession, that Saul went to her

by night, that probably she or some one connected with her was a ventriloquist, and in the case of Saul, she had all the advantages of darkness to aid her in the work of deception, that she might be well acquainted with Samuel, and therefore might easily give such a description of what she pretended she beheld, as would cause Saul, firm believer as he evidently was in the art of necromancy, to think that she actually saw the prophet. She had doubtless heard of the declarations and prophecies of Samuel, that God had rejected Saul, and had given the kingdom to another, and that David had actually been anointed by the command of God, and was to be the successor of Saul; that unhappy king himself knew all these facts: indeed, they were matters of public notoriety. Moreover, it was easy for the witch to see that his time was come; that the storms of the Divine vengeance were gathering thick around him; and that as he was forsaken by God, there was no hope of his escape; for a general belief of all this, and, consequently, of the prophetic character of Samuel, is by no means irreconcilable with her pretensions to witchcraft. She probably knew likewise the strength of the Philistines' army and the comparative weakness of that of Saul; and she saw his trepidation and gloomy forebodings—how could he avoid these, when he knew that God had cast him off? Doubtless, then, the despair which caused him to faint when he heard, as he supposed, the declaration of Samuel, "The Lord shall deliver Israel with thee into the hand of the Philistines," was secretly working in his breast before, and would manifest itself in his countenance, and in all his actions. She might easily therefore predict the event of the battle; and a regard to her credit, for her statements were heard by the servants of Saul, and probably by others, would induce her to foretell what she thought would come to pass. And to carry on the deception, and maintain her own pretensions, it was necessary to do this in the name of Samuel, and therefore to cause the king to believe that the prophet spoke to him in the name of God. It is perhaps commonly supposed that Saul heard Samuel speaking to him, or, at least, that he thought he heard him; but this is by no means certain; as he did not at first see Samuel, but believed he was there from the description which the woman gave of his appearance, so he might never hear any voice himself; the supposed enchantress might state to the king what she pretended the prophet said. I know it is maintained by some, that though Saul did not see any one at first, he did afterwards; since it is said that he "*perceived* it was Samuel, and he bowed himself to the earth." But the word which is rendered "perceived," *yadang*, by no means implies that he saw him, but merely that he learned, or thought from the description which the woman gave, that he was there, and then he would naturally, looking on him as a messenger from the invisible world, and even from God, bow himself to the earth. Indeed, I cannot but think that the natural inference from the whole narration is, that Saul never saw

anything, but that he trusted entirely to the reports of the woman. If Samuel was actually raised from the dead, or sent from heaven, by the power of God, according to the belief of some, or if Satan, or any of his angels, personated him by assuming his form, why did not Saul see it at once? What was to render it visible to him afterwards? So far, then, as it is absurd to suppose that any evil spirit could either raise Samuel from the dead, or bring his spirit from the invisible world, so there is no evidence from the history that any familiar spirit personated Samuel. We may account for everything from the craft of the sorceress, and from the necessity under which she was laid of speaking in the name of Samuel, and of employing such language it might be supposed he would have used, had he been present.

But there is another hypothesis, which on account of its plausibility, in some respects, the way in which it enables those who adopt it to explain one part of the narrative, and the talents, piety, and learning of some by whom it has been adopted, must be noticed here. It has recently been stated and defended with great clearness and force, by one to whom on account of his ability, learning, and piety, as much deference is due as ever can be given to human authority. The hypothesis is this: that whatever the woman might be, however unable she was to accomplish what she undertook, God was pleased to interpose on this occasion, and either to raise Samuel from the dead, or to send his Spirit from heaven, in order to assume the form which he wore when on earth, to reprove and reproach Saul, and to foretell his death and that of his sons, together with the defeat of the Israelitish army. And they urge in support of this hypothesis, that "the woman was evidently surprised and terrified at what she saw, that something took place which she did not expect, and that she immediately recognized Saul, and, after answering his question respecting the form of the apparition, left the king and the resuscitated prophet to continue the solemn interview."[1] It further urged that the appearance of Samuel is a simple historical fact, as much so as any other recorded in the Bible, and that no less than five times it is expressly stated by the inspired writer that it was Samuel. It is farther pleaded, and with perfect propriety, that it is the Spirit of God who is here speaking, and not any other person; so that it is in effect the Holy Spirit who says that it was Samuel that appeared, and who spoke and prophesied; "so that the passage is not introduced as containing an account given by some uninspired person, but as a continuation of the sacred history, and perfectly tallies with the preceding and following context. The rejection of its obvious import can be effected only at the hazard of unsettling the entire basis of the Divinely-inspired narrative."[2] Such arguments as those just now quoted, connected with such an assertion as that which follows them, and that from so eminent a Biblical scholar and critic, may well make any one pause, before he ventures to maintain a contrary hypothesis, and may, perhaps, in the estimation of some, expose him to the charge of temerity for making the attempt. And I must own that some of the arguments are so powerful, and the difficulties of the whole subject so great, as to cause me to hesitate, and after all to embrace and advocate a contrary opinion with some diffidence. Still on the whole I must embrace and advocate it, as being that which is attended with the fewest difficulties, and as being most accordant with the sacred narrative, and with the general doctrine and principles of the scriptures.

[1] *Henderson on Inspiration*, p. 167. [2] *Ib.*, p. 169.

I know well that it is not for us to limit the Holy One of Israel; and that we are seldom in greater danger of erring than when, uninstructed by facts and the declarations of the Bible, we undertake to say either what God can, or must, or cannot do. "Who hath prescribed to him his way, or who shall say to him, Thou hast wrought iniquity?" Still, I find it difficult to conceive that the Divine Being, after having refused to answer Saul by either "dreams, or Urim, or prophets;" that is, in any lawful or prescribed way, should, when he had recourse to unlawful arts, to a practice which is forbidden under pain of death, have wrought a miracle to give him an answer and to gratify his curiosity. I know it is said this was done to punish him. But the addition which this made to the punishment which was hanging over him was so slight, that it is not easy to see how it was consistent with the character of God to work a great miracle in order to secure its infliction. Besides, Saul was in such a state of suspense and perplexity, that it is questionable whether he would not deliberately have chosen, in order to be delivered from it, to know the worst; so that in fact he was gratified, rather than punished. Samuel is thought, by those who maintain the opinion in question, to have been resuscitated. How much is implied in this? He had not been very long dead; probably his body was not entirely decayed. Is it supposed or asserted, then, that it was actually restored to life, and brought beneath the ground from Ramah to Endor, and caused there to ascend, according to the representation of the witch, out of the earth? But must not this have been done, in order to present the appearances which were said to be exhibited, and even to work the miracle which is supposed to have been performed? If Samuel had been commissioned to foretell the death of Saul, is it not much more likely that his spirit would have been sent from heaven in human form? and therefore it would have appeared to come from the skies, and not rise out of the ground, in a way calculated to confirm the sorceress, and all who were present, in their belief of the efficacy of her enchantments and spells, or to beget faith in them if it did not previously exist. It is indeed said that one end to be answered by the event was, "a more complete exposure of gross superstition and imposture." Now I can scarcely conceive of anything less calculated to answer this end, or more likely to cause all who witnessed this.

transaction, or who heard of it, to believe in the efficacy of witchcraft. There is no intimation given by the historian that the supposed miracle was wrought by Divine power, or that anything which the woman did not expect took place; at least nothing more transpired *than what she undertook to effect*, when she said, "*Whom shall I bring up to thee?*" All that we read is, that Saul applied to the witch; she promised to bring up to him whomsoever he should specify; he named Samuel; the sorceress betook herself to her divinations, and according to her, Samuel appeared. This, in my apprehension, would have done more, supposing the prophet was really brought from the invisible world, to secure belief in the art of necromancy, than anything, or than all things, that had occurred since the beginning of the world. If the woman had no faith in her spells before, this was enough to cause her to believe in them afterwards; and to think, if she viewed the appearance of Samuel as a miracle, that her incantations had power in heaven as well as in hell. I must own that if I believed that Samuel was really raised from the dead, or brought from heaven on the occasion in question, I do not know how I could avoid a belief in the efficacy of necromancy. I cannot see how it could be consistent with the character of the Divine Being, or in unison with anything which, as far as we know, he has ever done, to work a miracle, so closely and apparently connected with the spells of witchcraft, and yet to give no intimation that he had interposed.

It is argued that something took place which the woman did not expect; that she was surprised and terrified when she saw Samuel, and that she manifested this by crying out, and by being enabled immediately to recognize Saul. It is not said, however, that she was terrified, but merely that she "cried out." This she might very naturally do, in order to aid the deception which she was carrying on, and to cause the king to believe that she saw something supernatural. And how the sight of Samuel, supposing that he did appear, could enable the woman to know Saul, I cannot conceive. For she exclaimed, "Why hast thou deceived me? for thou art Saul," before the supposed Samuel had uttered a single word. She did not receive her information from him. If the association of ideas led to the discovery, why had not the name of Samuel the same influence? She might know him before, and yet to gain the greater credit to the influence of her art, she might pretend to have gained the knowledge by her charms; or when she uttered her loud cry, Saul, who was a believer in witchcraft, might have been surprised and terrified, and thus led unawares to do something which would enable her to recognize him. The querulous complaint, "Why hast thou disquieted me to bring me up?" accords better with the witch personating Samuel than with the dignity of a messenger from the invisible world.

The most powerful argument, and the only one of any importance, for the actual appearance of the prophet, and the greatest difficulty connected with the opposite opinion, is that the sacred writer repeatedly uses the word "Samuel," and represents him as present, and as speaking. Here we have a choice of difficulties, and I must think that those which are connected with the hypothesis that Samuel was raised from the dead, are far greater than those which are presented by supposing that the sacred writer narrates what occurred according to the profession of the sorceress, and the belief of those who were present. It must be allowed by all that the inspired penmen do sometimes use popular and not philosophical language; in other words, relate things as they appeared, and as they were believed to be, and not according to their reality. Instances in abundance, in illustration of this position, are given by defenders of the modern system of geology.

There are some who think that Samuel was neither raised from the dead, nor sent from heaven, but that a vision or specter was presented to Saul, or to the woman, caused perhaps by the ministry of an angel, and that Samuel was then personated, and a conversation with the king was carried on in his name. This interpretation is liable to many of the objections that have been urged against the one which has just been examined. And neither those who adopt it, nor those who think that a spirit was raised by the incantation of the woman, can attach much importance to the principal objection which lies against the hypothesis which I have endeavored to defend, namely: that the sacred writer repeatedly says that it was Samuel himself who appeared. For if it was merely a vision presented to the imagination of Saul, still it could not in strict propriety of language, but only by way of accommodation, be said that Samuel appeared, and that Samuel spoke, when his body was in the grave, and his soul in heaven, and when it was either an angel that spoke, or else all was an illusion of the imagination. On the whole, the great probability, to say the least, is that there was no appearance either of any evil spirit, or of an angel, or of Samuel, on this occasion, but that all was managed by the art of the sorceress.
—*Sel.*

EDITORIAL.

OUR name [ADVENT CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY] has been subjected to some sharp criticism—more pointed than just, as we hope to show—and, also, has caused "the cold-shoulder" to be turned to us, when a different name, with no change in the character of THE QUARTERLY itself, would have secured a warm reception. The common ground taken by our critics in conversation or correspondence has been, that by introducing the word "Advent" we have adopted a "sectarian" name; that distinctive names are a chief cause of divisions in the church—a statement we expect to disprove; that God himself has given his people a name, and that they should be known or call themselves by no other. Among those holding to such views some have said to us: "I could not become a subscriber to your journal while it bears its present title; or recommend it; though it contains much excellent matter, the sentiment of which I can indorse."

These expressions of feeling have led us, we trust, to a candid examination of the evidence concerning the origin of the word Christian: and truly if it was in the infancy of the Gospel church imposed by our Heavenly Father as his own chosen name for his children, it should be their distinctive name to the exclusion of all others. Is it, then, of Divine origin?

The one only witness which can be cited in behalf of the supernatural origin of the term "Christian" is a passage from Acts 11: 26—"The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch." Now after a careful study of this passage and its context, we are unable to discover anything in either it or its context to indicate that Inspiration had any hand in the giving of this name. We should rather suppose that the success of the Apostolic preaching was such as to attract the attention of the public, who, as usual in such cases even to this day, "called" the converts to the new opinions after some prominent feature of the faith, or the teacher of their doctrine. And as the apostles preached CHRIST, and referred to him as the author of all their doctrine, we can easily conceive what the most natural designation of the new "sect" (Acts 28: 22) would be.

Dr. Thomas Scott on this passage says: "'It came to pass that they [Paul and Barnabas] called the disciples Christians.' This is indisputably the natural construction of this verse. But the word implies that this was done by Divine revelation: for it has generally this signification in the New Testament, and is rendered *warned from God*, or *warned of God*, even when there is no word for God in the Greek."

Dr. Adam Clarke attempts to sustain this bold assumption. He says it accords with the sense of *one* manuscript, the *Codex Bezæ*, which reads: "And there they [*i. e.*, Saul and Barnabas] first called the disciples at Antioch, Christians." But he does not add the fact that this reading is not sustained by other manuscripts, or that no critic receives it as the true rendering of the passage. It can only be quoted as a make-weight in the discussion; for as an argument it cannot be entertained. The reading in this one manuscript is probably the copyist's gloss of the passage, or it may be a clerical error.

But Dr. Clarke says further: "The word *chrematisai*, which we translate 'were called,' signifies in the New Testament, to appoint, warn, or nominate by Divine direction. *If* therefore the name was given by Divine appointment, it is most likely that Saul and Barnabas were directed to give it." From these premises he proceeds to deduce some very taking conclusions, which have doubtless been received by many of his readers as absolutely correct, they overlooking the fact that the Doctor has in the start simply *begged the question*, and then said "IF" the name be inspired, we conclude thus and so. But if it is *not* inspired, then no conclusions from the premise that it is can be legitimate. Now it must be evident to any reader of his comments on Acts 11: 26, that the Doctor was strongly prejudiced in favor of the idea that the name "Christian" was given by the direct agency of the Holy Spirit: this being clear, it follows he never would have said—"*If* the name were given by Divine appointment," had the evidence in his opinion justifed the broad assertion of Scott, that it was thus given through the apostles; nor have we found any scholar who sustains his statement: but, on the contrary, many who contradict it.

We crave the reader's candid attention to a few thoughts and facts concerning the word *chrematizo*, which Dr. Clarke has cited as meaning "to appoint, warn, or nominate by *Divine direction*." While it is true that this seems to be *a* meaning of the word, it is also true that it is only a *secondary* definition, and not the primary or essential sense. Its primary signification is, *to transact business*. (Bagster, Greenfield, Donnegan, Robinson.) It also means *to receive a name*, or *appellation*, *be styled*, etc. And it has besides the secondary and occasional sense of *an oracular utterance*, or *intimation of the Divine will*, or *a supernatural revelation*. In five instances out of the nine[1] times the word occurs in various forms in the New Testament *chrematizo* is in the common version rendered in accordance with this occasional sense: four times "warned of God" (Matt. 2: 12, 22; Acts 10: 22; Heb. 11: 7), and once "was admonished of God." (Heb. 8: 5.) But in the Syriac it is *not once* thus rendered; nor in Campbell's Macknight; nor by Geo. Campbell in his *Gospels*, nor in the Rheims version. In the *Diaglott* it is rendered in this secondary sense but three times. Besides, there is nothing in the word *chrematizo* itself expressive of the supernatural or divine: this sense appears in every case in the New Testament to be derived, not from the word itself, but from the connection in which it is used. From these considerations it will be seen that the argument for the Divine appointment of the name Christian deduced from an occasional meaning of the word *chrematizo* is utterly worthless.

[1] The other instances are: "It was *revealed* unto him by the Holy Spirit" (Luke 2: 26); "Who refused him *that spake* on earth" (Heb. 12: 25); "She *shall be called* an adulteress" (Rom. 7: 3); "The disciples *were called* Christians first at Antioch." (Acts 11: 26.)

Albert Barnes says: "No certain argument can be drawn in regard to the source of the name from the word which is used here." Then after defining the word, he adds: "It is certainly *possible* that the name was given by Barnabas and Saul. I incline to the opinion, however, that it was *given them by the Gentiles who were there*, simply as an appellation, without intending it as a name of reproach, and that it was readily *assumed* by the disciples as a name that would fitly designate them. If it had been [first?] assumed by them, or if Barnabas and Saul had conferred the name, the record would probably have been to that effect: not simply that they 'were called,' but that they took this name, or that it was given by the apostles. It is however of little consequence whence the name originated."

And Alexander Campbell says: "I am bold to affirm in the face of all criticism, that there is not the least authority *in the word here used* [*chrematizo*] for concluding that the name 'Christian' came from God any more than from Antiochus Epiphanes. This may be too strong for some who contend that the name 'Christian' is of *Divine authority*, but let them put me to the proof."

Some have cited the Fathers in support of the Divine origin of the name "Christian:" but their contradictory testimony is of little value, except as it is a matter of interest to know their personal opinions in the matter. Theodore of Mopsuestra says:[1] "As the Platonics and Epicureans and men of other sects are called from their masters, who first taught the principles professed by them; so Christians are called from Christ....And the apostles therefore gave us this denomination that we might be reminded of our obligation to adhere to Christ's doctrine." But Chrysostom says the name was from Paul;[2] while others give Evodius, bishop of Antioch, the honor of conferring the title. Eusebius simply remarks: "The epithet of Christian first sprung up at that place [Antioch], as from a grateful and productive soil."[3] Dean Milman remarks: "The body of believers *assumed* the name of Christian," but does not give the reasons for this conclusion.

In *The People's Dictionary of the Bible* we find the following remarks: "The name Christian, however, did not arise in the bosom of the church, as appears from the passage in the New Testament in which it occurs, and from the exclusive prevalence in the Christian community of other appellations. Nor did it come from the Jews, who would by no means give so holy a name as one derived immediately from Christ [Messiah] to the hated sect of Nazarenes....We must accordingly look to paganism for the origin of the name; and its Roman form suggests that it originated with the Romans who dwelt at Antioch. The magistrates of the city would consider it their duty to keep an eye on the new, rising, and troublesome sect. Hence *the necessity of a name by which it might be spoken of*. Its advocates were always discoursing of Jesus as *the Christ*. 'Christian' therefore came to be the denomination employed by heathen lips. As proceeding from heathens, the name Christian could hardly fail to be used in a bad sense. Accordingly, it appears to be with a tone of irony that Agrippa said unto Paul—'Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.' (Acts 26: 28.) And from 1 Pet. 4: 16, it is obvious that the nameitself was an offence and a crime—'If any suffer *as a Christian*, let him not be ashamed.'"

[1] Lardner, vol. IV., p. 402. [2] *Ib.*, p. 557-8. [3] b. 2, ch. 3.

Conybeare and Howson[1] remark on this passage: "Thus Jews and Gentiles, who, under the teaching of Paul, believed that Jesus of Nazareth was the Savior of the world, 'were first called Christians.' It is not likely that they received this name from the Jews. The 'children of Abraham' employed a term much more expressive of hatred and contempt. They called them 'the sect of the Nazarenes.' These disciples of Jesus traced their origin to Nazareth, in Galilee: and it was a proverb that nothing good could come from Nazareth. Besides this, there was a further reason why the Jews would not have called the disciples of Jesus by the name of 'Christians.' The word Christ has the same meaning with 'Messiah.' And the Jews, however blinded and prejudiced on this subject, would never have used so sacred a word to point an expression of mockery and derision; and they could not have used it in grave and serious earnest, to designate those whom they held to be the followers of a false Messiah, a fictitious Christ.

"Nor is it likely that the Christians gave this name to themselves. In the Acts of the Apostles, and in their own letters, we find them designating themselves as 'brethren,' 'disciples,' 'believers,' 'saints.' Only in two places do we find the term 'Christians;' and in both places it is implied to be a term used by those who are without. There is little doubt that the name originated with the Gentiles, who began to see now that this new sect was so far distinct from the Jews that they might naturally receive a new designation. And the form of the word implies that it came from the Romans, not from the Greeks. The word 'Christ' was often in the conversation of the believers, as we know it to have been constantly in their letters. 'Christ' was the title of him whom they avowed as their Leader and their Chief. They confessed that this Christ had been crucified, but they asserted that he was risen from the dead, and that he guarded them by his invisible power. Thus *Christian* was the name which naturally found its place in the reproachful language of their enemies.[2]

"In the first instance, we have every reason to believe that it was a term of ridicule and derision. And it is remarkable that the people of Antioch were notorious for inventing names of derision, and for turning their wit into channels of ridicule. And in every way there is something very significant in the place where we first received the name we bear. Not in Jerusalem, the city of the Old Covenant, the city of the people who were chosen to the exclusion of all others, but in a heathen city, the Eastern center of Greek fashion and Roman luxury; and not until it was shown that the New Covenant was inclusive of all others, then and there, we were first called Christians, and *the church received from the world* its true and honorable name."

Dr. Philip Schaff, the learned historian of the Apostolic church, confirms the above in the following language:[3] "It was there [Antioch]....that the name 'Christians' originated. This appellation was not assumed by the Christians themselves. They rather called themselves 'disciples,' 'believers,' 'saints,' 'brethren.' Still less was it given them by the Jews....The name came to them from the heathen, who applied it to the followers of Jesus Christ either in mockery, or from a misunderstanding, taking the term 'Christ' for a proper name, instead of an official title."

Dr. Schaff remarks further, and the suggestion seems a probable one: "It was soon, however, universally adopted by the believers; and we may hence suppose that, notwithstanding its heathen origin, it arose not without a divine purpose, as a kind of unconscious prophecy, like the prediction of Caiaphas. The name, Christians, expresses most briefly and clearly the divine destiny of man, and always holds before the believer the high idea after which he should strive; that is, to have his own life a copy and continuation of the life of Christ."

It is a general, a comprehensive name, not excluding any proper appellation, but including all others designating a true follower of the Messiah.

[1] *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, vol. I., pp. 119-20.
[2] It is a Latin derivative, from the Greek term for the Messiah of the Jews. It is connected with the office, not the name of the Savior....The word Herodians is formed precisely the same way. [3] *Hist. Apostolic Church*, pp. 234-5.

Kitto, in his *Daily Bible Illustrations*, says: "It does not seem that the name was spontaneously assumed by the disciples themselves. If that had been the case, we should probably have met with it frequently in the remainder of the history, as well as in the writings of the apostles. But we find that after, as before, they continued to be styled among themselves 'believers,' 'brethren,' 'saints,' 'disciples.' In the Acts the term 'Christian' only occurs once again (ch. 26: 28), and in the Epistles it is found only in 1 Pet. 4, and, as in the instance just cited, seems to be *used or applied by persons not themselves professing the religion.*"

Wm. Smith, in his *Dictionary of the Bible*, says: "It is clear that the appellation....*could not* have been assumed by the Christians themselves." And in Barnum's abridgement of the same work we read: "The name Christian, then, which in the only other cases where it appears in the New Testament (Acts 26: 28; 1 Pet. 4: 16: comp. Tacitus,[1] *Ann.* 15: 44) is used contemptuously, could not have been originally applied by the early disciples to themselves, though *afterwards* adopted and gloried in by them:....it must, therefore, have been imposed upon them by the Gentile world."

Lange says: "It has long since, and with great truth, been said that the Christians did not originally apply this name to themselves: for throughout the New Testament it is employed by those who are not Christians....*No other explanation is possible, except that the name proceeded from the pagans;* and this view is sustained by the form of the word, which, in every respect, resembles the names of political parties, such as *Herodians* (Matt. 22: 16), *Cæsarians*, Pompeians."[2]

D. F. Bacon, in his *Lives of the Apostles*, says:[3] "The name now first created by the Syrians to distinguish the sect, is remarkable, because, being derived from a Greek word, *Christos*, it has a Latin adjective termination, *Christianus*, and is therefore *shown to have been applied by the Roman inhabitants of Antioch;* for no Grecian would ever have been guilty of such a barbarism as the derivation of one word from another in his own language."

Alexander Campbell has these just and vigorous remarks:[4] "With us it is a strong argument, that had the churches been first called Christians by *Divine* appointment at Antioch, then the apostles would have addressed the disciples by this divinely appointed name. But this they did not do *so much as once* in any public document which has come down to us. The Antiochians called the disciples first Christians; and Peter said, if any man was indicted as a Christian, or if any man suffered as a Christian, let him not be *ashamed;* which argues that it was under this name their enemies persecuted and traduced them. But no document has come down to us authorizing us to think that this name Christian was regarded by any of the apostles as of Divine appointment. If Paul, in any of his letters—if Peter, James, or John had only *once* said, 'To the Christians in Rome, Corinth, Galatia, Asia, Greece, Judea,' or anywhere else, then, indeed, there might have been some ground to think that they regarded it as of Divine appointment! And recollect, it was fifty years and more from the time they were first called Christians before all the New Testament was written. They are called disciples, saints, believers, &c., in the Acts and in the Epistles, but never once addressed under the name Christians....When it [the name Christian] is plead for as of Divine authority, and as the only or more fitting name which can be adopted, we must lift our voice against the imposition, and contend for liberty, where the Lord has left us free!"

We have quoted largely from eminent students of both language and history, that our readers may have the benefit of the evidence which convinced us that the assertion that the name "Christian" is of Divine prescription is utterly baseless. It can claim scarcely the shadow of a foundation in either scripture, philology, or history.

Yet there is another argument adduced, if it may be called an argument.

[1] Tacitus speaks of them as "a set of persons, hateful for their crimes, commonly called Christians."
[2] Dean Alford, however, questions this proof of its Latin origin; as "Latin forms," he claims, "had become naturalized among the Greeks." Other critics sustain Lange.
[3] pp. 510, 511. [4] *Mill. Harbinger*, Aug., 1856.

UMI

Dr. Whitby, the father of the modern spiritualizing school of interpretation, says: "The believing Jews and Gentiles being made one church, that the name of Jew or heathen might no more continue the distance that was between them, this new name was given to them both; as some conceive according to the prophecy mentioned." (Is. 65: 15.) But we ask, How can any intelligent person indulge such a conception for one moment in view of the facts in the case? Is it possible to believe that the teachers and writers of the New Testament would or could so utterly ignore a name which God both by prophecy and direct revelation had instructed them to give his church? There can be but one answer to this question. The fact that Luke in his historical sketch mentions the name Christian but twice—once as falling from the lips of an infidel king, as a term of reproach, and once as simply recording where the disciples first received the appellation; and that the only other writer of New Testament scripture who notices the name, mentions it as the title of an offence or crime which rendered one liable to punishment, demonstrates beyond the possibility of successful contradiction that not only Luke and Peter, but, also, James and Jude, and Paul and John, were utterly ignorant of any prophecy or revelation imposing the name 'Christian' upon the followers of the Lord Jesus as their proper and distinctive name.

And we not only thus disprove that God has given his people in this dispensation the name Christian as their proper and only title; but we also affirm that names are *not* the cause, but rather the *results* of divisions. It was not "saying" "I am of Paul," and "I am of Cephas," that created the divisions of the Corinthian church, but it was the inculcation of discordant doctrines attributed, unjustly of course, to these teachers. And thus it has ever been. In some cases the division has been caused by the rise of heresies in the church, which being properly rejected by the body, have caused a "sect" by the separation of the heretics. At other times divisions have arisen by the refusal of the church to allow the dissemination of neglected or present truth within her borders, whereupon reformers have been obliged to proclaim their message without her pale. In either case, a name has speedily been attached to, or assumed by the party thus formed, usually suggested by the name of a prominent leader or the title of some distinguishing doctrine. But in every case the division has been the antecedent, and not the result of the name.

None can regret more deeply than we do the existence of "sects" in the church. They are a source of weakness, an immense waste of its power. But we know of no effectual remedy for the evil. We can at best but palliate it. This we propose to do, not by ignoring descriptive titles, or by the assumption of names which reflect upon the Christianity of others, nor by keeping our principles out of sight, or ceasing vigorous protest against the errors in both doctrine and practice of the church at large, but rather by cultivating scriptural charity or love; by extending our Christian fellowship to all lovers of Jesus who will accept of it; and by labor in harmony with all Christians who will allow us "the right of private judgment" in matters of faith, and freedom in the proclamation of the same. We indulge no delusive dreams of an organic or complete union of the true church in this age. The experience of all the past proves the truth of the inspired declaration, that two cannot walk together except they be agreed. But while endeavoring to the best of our ability to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," we joyfully anticipate the near approach of that period when we shall "see eye to eye;" nor will our harmony then be in the least injured by the bestowal, upon each one, of "a white stone, and in the stone a *new name* written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it." But until the arrival of that happy era we must proclaim the precious and glorious truths which cluster around the doctrine of the second advent of Christ. In him and his coming all our hopes center; hence, the name we have chosen. And by the blessing of God, and the continued favors of its many friends, we trust to be able to continue until the end a zealous advocacy of "the present truth" in THE ADVENT CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

THE

Advent Christian Quarterly.

VOL. II. OCTOBER, 1870. NO. II.

THE TIME OF REWARD.

BY THE EDITOR.

"I will reward them that hate me." (Deut. 32: 41.)
"He is a rewarder of them who diligently seek him." (Heb. 11: 6.)

The popular belief concerning the time of reward is that at death every person, for the soul, or spirit, is esteemed to be the *real* person, passes at once to his meed of eternal pleasure in the presence of God and the Lamb, or, if condemned, to the damnation of hell. There are some modifications of this view—theories which assign departed souls an intermediate condition of blessedness or wo, in Paradise or Tartarus, where they await the full fruition of bliss, or deeper and more penetrating anguish, after the judgment and resurrection.

This modification of the common view of going to heaven or hell at death, is based, mainly, upon an inconsistent interpretation of one of our Savior's parables (Luke 16: 19–31), and a misconception of his words addressed to the dying thief. But as these topics are fully discussed in other connections, we will not here review them, but pass to the consideration of some arguments, which, we think, thoroughly refute all theories of reward in any degree subsequent to death and prior to the resurrection.

There is another theory, however, that we should mention, for the number of its adherents is increasing rapidly. It places the resurrection and judgment at, or in immediate connection with death. This theory does away altogether with what is commonly called "the resurrection of the body." According to it,

at or in death, the soul drops, or emerges from the "natural body," assumes the promised "spiritual body," enters upon the eternal state—and this is the resurrection. We purpose no direct reply to this theory, as it will be overturned in the progress of the affirmative argument we shall adduce; but we will present some thoughts for the consideration of those, who, looking for a judgment at the end of the world, be that event at hand, or ages in the future, still affirm that the dead have already commenced, to some degree, to partake of their final retribution.

The fact of the judgment being admitted, we inquire, What is its character and object? And we reply: It must be (1) either for an examination of character, precedent to a decision; or (2) for the public rendition and execution of a sentence already determined. If the first proposition be descriptive of its character, then, with the theory we impugn, the prophesied judgment of the great day of God becomes a solemn farce: for it is hardly possible to indulge a more preposterous idea, than to suppose that when, in the end of this world, Heaven or Paradise, and Hell or Tartarus shall have delivered up their innumerable throngs, any occupant of either place will be found to have been previously assigned to the wrong place.

But if it be for the public announcement, and exemplary execution of previously determined sentences, the judgment-scene would still be no less a farce. For can we conceive, for instance, of the patriarchs, as, after wearing their crowns of glory for ages, coming to solemn judgment to *receive* those crowns? Can we imagine Dives, after having been tormented with fire and brimstone, or their equivalent, for some centuries, "in the presence of the Lamb, and of his holy angels," as coming before the throne of God to receive his sentence to that same awful doom he is supposed to be already enduring? What is the object of this solemn travesty of judgment? It cannot be an exemplary scene: the sorrows and the anguish of damnation are no more apparent to the universe than they were before. Nor does the fact that a resurrection, supposed to be the reunion of souls and bodies, is connected with this scene, at all affect its relations. Even if the anticipated reunion of immortal souls with their bodies should be the means of increasing the bliss of the saints, or aggravating the agony of the lost, there is nothing in such reunion that calls for or can be styled a judgment.

The only theory with which *all* the scriptures, literal or figurative, descriptive of the judgment-scene can be harmonized, is that which teaches that "all who are IN THE GRAVES shall come forth" (John 5: 28, 29); "some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." (Dan. 12: 1, 2.) The judgment will be set, the books opened, and the dead judged out of the things written in the books.[1] Before the throne will be two, and ony two, classes: those whose names are found written in the Book of Life, and those whose names have been blotted out of that record. The former will have come forth to the resurrection of life; the latter to the resurrection of condemnation. And the judgment will consist in the announcement and exemplary execution of the awards and sentences of all mankind. "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, *that* every one *may receive* the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." (2 Cor. 5: 10.) This grand assize will not be the scene of renewal of previous conditions of happiness and misery, but of the annunciation and execution of sentences previously held in abeyance.

[1] Of course there will be no literal books produced. The facts and decisions are all in the mind of God. But the action is presented to our minds under the figure of books of record.

Leaving this point, let us examine the scriptural basis upon which those who entertain a hope of entering heaven at death, rest their faith. And did not Jesus say to his persecuted ones—"Great is your reward *in heaven?*" We remark that the most that can be said for this passage is that it does not *contradict* the idea of going to heaven for a residence; yet neither does it necessarily imply it. To illustrate: Suppose a master workman promises a servant certain wages for onerous labors to be performed. Said wages are to be deposited in a bank, it may be at a considerable distance from the servant's residence, but subject to his order. If he should mention the fact that he was accumulating a great reward for his labors in a certain National Bank, would one infer therefrom that he anticipated eventually taking up his *residence* in that bank? We trow not. His reward is in the bank for safe keeping: he can draw and enjoy it whenever *the time agreed upon* arrives. Christ has agreed to reckon with his servants *when he returns* (Luke 19: 15): meanwhile his faithful disciples employ their "talents" wisely, and are laying up their "treasure in heaven, where moth and rust do not corrupt, nor thieves break through and steal." (Matt. 6: 20.)

Paul says: "Ye took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven [or better, 'know-

ing that ye have for yourselves'] a better and enduring substance. Cast not away, therefore, your confidence, which hath great recompense of reward." (Heb. 10: 34, 35.) The words "in heaven," are an interpolation, now rejected by critical scholars. The apostle's language implies a reward to be bestowed at some future time. Doubtless it is the same to which Moses had respect (Heb. 11: 26), together with the long list of worthies enumerated by Paul in Heb. 11, who, he says, "without us should not be made perfect"—that is, receive the fruition of the promises, and enter upon their reward, in the "better resurrection." (vv. 40, 35.)

But it is asked: "Does not Peter say to us, there is "an inheritance, incorruptible and undefiled, that fadeth not away, *reserved in heaven* for you?" He certainly does: but he is far from teaching that we go to heaven at death, or any other time, to enjoy it. His doctrine is that the saints are begotten to a living hope of that inheritance "by *the resurrection* of Jesus Christ from the dead;" and it is *reserved*, kept back, preserved in safety for those who are "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation; *ready to be revealed* IN THE LAST TIME." (1 Pet. 1: 3-5.) "Wherefore," he adds, "gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that shall be BROUGHT UNTO YOU *at the revelation of Jesus Christ.*" (v. 13.)

We are reminded that Paul said—"Our conversation is in heaven." But he does not say *we* are there, or are ever going there. And which ever of the various opinions of critics concerning the meaning of the word *politeuma* (rendered 'conversation') be correct, it does not affect our argument. If we render it '*citizenship*,' with some; or '*our city*,' as another suggests; or '*polity*,' or '*conversation*,' or '*conduct*,' the context will still read —"Our *politeuma* is in heaven, FROM WHENCE also *we look for* the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body" (Phil. 3: 20, 21); Paul thus teaching the Philippians as he had before taught the Thessalonians, to "wait for God's Son *from* heaven," with no hint of an expectation that they would ever go there themselves. Why indulge the absurdity of waiting for Jesus to come to us, if we expect to go to him?

John confirms Paul's doctrine, saying—"It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that WHEN HE SHALL APPEAR we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." No

longer behold him by the eye of faith alone, but face to face meet the transforming gaze of our Redeemer's countenance. Could or would John have used such language if he had expected to spend eighteen hundred years, or one year, *before his coming*, with Christ, seeing him as he is," "beholding his glory," and yet *not* made "like him?" Christ must "come again" before we can see him, be with him, or be made like him. "When Christ who is our life *shall appear*, THEN shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. 3: 4.) And if it is to be *then*, it never will or can be *till* then.

In this connection we ask the candid consideration of an argument bearing on this question, drawn from the types of the Mosaic law. We consider it an unanswerable objection to all theories which convey the saints in any form, to the presence of Christ, in either Heaven or Paradise (if they be deemed different places), before the resurrection.

In Heb. 8 and 9 Paul relates the details of the tabernacle service, bringing out clearly their typical bearing. He tells us how the priests went daily into the outer apartment, called the Holy Place, accomplishing the service of God: but into the inner apartment, the Most Holy Place, "went the *High Priest* ALONE, once every year. He then explains that Christ, the anti-typical High Priest, needed to make *his* offering, and enter the Most Holy Place, but once, having thereby obtained eternal redemption for us; and says: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but *into* HEAVEN ITSELF, now to appear in the presence of God for us."

Mark the type! The High Priest went ALONE into the Most Holy Place, and *no one else was allowed to enter, or be with him there.* It was death for any one to attempt an entrance while he was there. Our Great High Priest has ascended to *heaven alone:* and the type demands that his people *wait* WITHOUT for him to come out of the Holy Places not made with hands, to bless them.

The typical High Priest took the blood of a goat—for he could not offer his own—into the Holy of Holies, to make atonement in figure for the people: the blood being the life, signifying that death is the wages of sin. The offering being accepted, he came out, returning and appearing to the congregation, who were *waiting* outside, to bless them.

The anti-typical High Priest took neither the blood of bulls or of goats, but pouring out his own soul unto death, "was once offered to bear the sins of many;" has entered into "heaven itself," there to act as Mediator between man and his God, "and unto them who *look for him* shall he appear the second time, without sin [*i. e.* without a sin-offering] unto salvation."

While our Redeemer tarries in the Holy Place none of his people may approach him; but presently he shall "shovel time and days out of the way," "put his bright face through the clouds," and "appear" to the joy of his people, and to the shame of his own and their enemies.

In this connection it may be asked: Did not Jude write, quoting from Enoch—"Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of *his* saints, to execute judgment upon all?" Indeed he does, and the fact that he comes with them *to execute judgment*, ought to convince every one that these saints are not the 'immortal souls' of men, nor indeed, men in any condition. Who, then, are they? We answer, the same saints who accompanied the Lord when he "came from Sinai, and rose up from Mount Seir unto them. He shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came with *ten thousands of his saints*." (Deut. 33: 2.) And these *saints* are identified by David to be, not the glorified spirits of dead and buried men, but—"The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: the Lord is among them as in Sinai, the holy place." (Ps. 68: 17.)

"Saints" is not a term used of mankind alone; but is applied also to other holy beings. When David says he "heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint that spake," etc., he refers unquestionably to angels or "holy ones," such as Nebuchadnezzar beheld in his vision, coming down from heaven. (Dan. 8: 13; 4: 13.)

That the judgment-executing *saints* of Enoch's prophecy are the angels, appears from a comparison with other scripture. "The Son of man shall send forth *his angels* and *they* shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity, and cast them into a furnace of fire." (Matt. 13: 41.) "The Son of man shall come....with his holy angels." (Matt. 16: 27.) "all the holy angels with him." (Matt. 25: 31.) They are the "mighty ones" of Joel's prophecy. (ch. 3: 11.) For "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven *with his mighty angels*, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel,....who shall be punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord,....*when he shall come!*"

The "ten thousands of his saints" who will come with the King of kings and Lord of lords are "the armies of heaven," which he shall lead forth to the battle of the great day of God Almighty. *They* shall sweep his enemies before them in inglorious and eternal defeat, casting them into the furnace of fire destined to make a clean riddance from the universe of Satan and all his works and allies.

The scripture doctrine of the 'intermediate state' presents an incontrovertible objection to the notion that mankind enter upon their reward at death. Nothing can be clearer than Paul's statement of the case in 1 Cor. 15: 32—"If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me if *the dead rise not?* [If they are not to rise] let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die."

Now it does seem that if we may understand by the language a writer uses the ideas he intends to convey, that Paul here teaches that THE RESURRECTION is our only hope of a future life: if that fails, the Epicurean philosophy, from which he quotes, is as acceptable doctrine as any other. His position is this: 'When I was compelled to choose between apostasy and risking my life in a contest with the wild beasts of the Ephesian circus, for the amusement of heathen spectators, I chose to risk this present life, because I believed if I *did* lose *it*, I had a life "hid with Christ in God," and should live again, at the last day, by virtue of a *resurrection from the dead*. But if this doctrine be not true, "if the dead rise not," then how foolish to risk the termination of the only life I shall ever have: rather let me live and enjoy my fill of the pleasures life affords; for the Epicureans are right, and death is an eternal sleep.'

This is indisputably the sense of the apostle's language quoted above; for he says again: "If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised. And if Christ be not raised, your faith *is vain*; ye are yet in your sins; then they also [or, 'and as a consequence they also] who are fallen asleep *are perished* [*apoleumi*—utterly destroyed.]"[1] Now if it can be proved that the soul or spirit survives the death of the body, and continues to exist in a condition

[1] Dr. Mortimer, late head Master of the London City School, says the following is a literal rendering of this passage: "But if Christ has not been raised [from the dead], your faith is vain: ye are still in your sins: and as a consequence [*ara kai*], those who fell asleep in Christ were annihilated [when they fell asleep.]"

UMI

of bliss or woe, and *may* thus become a partaker of fullness of joy and pleasures forevermore, then Paul's argument is not only sophistry, but foolishness; for it will continue to live on whether the body ever rises, or not; and the continued existence of *the conscious man* cannot be predicated upon the resurrection. Therefore Paul taught there could be no reward until the resurrection and judgment.

The Psalmist, also, agrees to such doctrine when he says, incontestably speaking of the resurrection—"As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness," (Ps. 17: 15.) Would he have been satisfied to *sleep* until the resurrection, had he entertained any idea that there was for the saints an intermediate state of glory in Heaven or Paradise? Let our own hearts answer. And did not Jesus promise a recompense *at the resurrection of the just* to those who should imitate him in doing good to the poor, the maimed, the halt, and the blind? (Luke 14: 14.) Why speak of the sometime distant resurrection, if we are to enjoy a partial fruition, perhaps ages before that event?

The era of the judgment, or time of reward, is distinctly located by Paul: "The Lord Jesus Christ, ... shall judge the quick and the dead *at his appearing and kingdom*." (2 Tim. 4: 1.) The second advent and the establishment of Christ's kingdom, synchronize with that "day" God hath appointed, "in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." (Acts 17: 31.) The semi-parable of Matt. 25, reads in strict conformity to the natural sense of the above passages: "When the Son of man *shall come* in his glory.. .THEN shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations. . . .THEN shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. . . .THEN shall he say unto them on his left hand, Depart ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. . . .And [THEN] these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."

Of this period Isaiah prophesied: "Behold, the Lord God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold his reward is with him, and his work [and a recompense for his work] before him." (Is. 40; 10.) And again he says (ch. 62:

11): "Behold the Lord hath proclaimed unto the end of the world, Say ye to the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy salvation cometh: behold his reward is with him and his work [or, recompense] before him." To these prophetic utterances agree the Savior's own words: "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and THEN he shall REWARD every *man* according to his works." (Matt. 16: 27.) And Peter reminds those who become partakers of Christ's sufferings, "that *when his glory shall be revealed* [not when they die] they may be glad, also, with exceeding joy. (1 Pet. 4: 13.) And Paul witnesses that God will "render to every man according to his deeds, ...indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, ...but glory, honor, and peace to every man that worketh good....*in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men* by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel." (Rom. 2: 6–16.) Any gospel, then, which proclaims that men are rewarded for their good or evil deeds at death, is another gospel than that which Paul preached.

This testimony is corroborated by the Revelator, who synchronizes the time of reward, the third woe, the kingdom of God and the judgment. He says: "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever. And the four and twenty elders which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshiped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, who art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and *the time of the dead that they should be judged*, and that thou shouldest *give reward* unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy [corrupt] the earth." (Rev. 11: 15–18.)

A later vision of the same scene is thus recorded: "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever

was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire. (Rev. 20: 12–15.)

But we are asked again, Did not Jesus say to one of his Asian churches—"Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life?" Certainly, he dictated those words: but he did *not* say he would give them a crown *at* death, as many suppose, thinking the passage reads—"Be faithful *until* death." Jesus was writing to a persecuted church, and he exhorts them to be faithful *unto* death—faithful even at the expense of their lives—and he would give them a crown of life when all the martyrs should be crowned.

It is a great error to suppose that any saint has yet received the promised crown of life and glory. So good and so great a saint as Paul, is yet without *his*. He freely gave everything for Christ, counting all he lost to be as but dung, if he might win him: but he looked not to behold his Master, not to receive his "incorruptible crown" (1 Cor. 9: 25), his "crown of *life*" in *death*. His hope was "laid up in heaven." (Col. 1: 5.) His gaze was directed to the day of Christ's coming. "What," he says, "is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, *at his coming*." (1 Thess. 2: 19.) "THEN we which are alive and remain shall be caught up, together with them [the resurrected saints] in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we [all the saints] ever be with the Lord." (ch. 4: 17.) It is inconceivable that in such a connection as this, Paul should so utterly ignore the doctrine of a conscious state of the dead saints, if that doctrine be true. His very silence is an unanswerable objection to the common theory. He had no faith in it. Hear him speaking to his son in the gospel, just before his decease: "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is *laid up* for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at *that day*: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." (2 Tim. 4: 6–8.)

"*That* day," when not only Paul, but all lovers of Jesus' appearing are to be crowned, refers us back to a day previously mentioned; and we find it in the first verse of the chapter—the day when Christ "shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom." He cherished no other hope for himself

than that he commended to the church: "When Christ, who is our Life *shall appear*, THEN shall ye also appear with him in glory." (Col. 3: 4.)

And why should preachers of the gospel in these last days, delude themselves and their hearers with the idea that death brings us rewarding crowns, when Peter, apostle and companion of our Lord, could only say to the church in his day—"When the chief Shepherd *shall appear* [THEN, and consequently not till then] ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." Why delude ourselves with the idea of being carried into glory by death, when the same apostle asseverates that even David is *not ascended* into the heavens, but is in his sepulcher with us unto this day. And when Christ declares that "no man hath ascended into heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man who is in heaven [or whose home is in heaven]; and again he says to the unbelieving Jews—"Ye shall seek me and shall not find me, and where I am ye cannot come;" and yet again to his disciples—"As I said unto the Jews, whither I go ye cannot come! *so now I say unto you;*" why deceive ourselves with the vain hope that our last, longest-lived enemy will do us the favor to act as our usher when death severs our connection with this world, and introduce us into the beatific vision of the presence of our Savior?

Is it not more reasonable, to say nothing of its being more scriptural, to accept as truth those, almost the last words of Jesus to his waiting church—"Behold I come quickly; and MY REWARD IS WITH ME, to give to every man according as his work shall be." (Rev. 22: 12.) And while we hope for that we as yet see not, let us with patience wait for it. (Rom. 8: 25.)

Great is the error that has obtained with reference to the time we shall obtain the promised victory over death. It was predicted by Isaiah, "He will swallow up death in victory." But this is not fulfilled in the funereal chamber, when all hearts are filled with sorrow, all eyes suffused with tears, and preparations are making to lay away the dead in their native dust; but victory comes when tears are wiped from all faces, when the vail spread over the face of all nations is rent away. Victory comes in the resurrection, not in dying. That this is the correct exegesis of the prediction is indisputable; for Paul himself is author of the gloss. For having set forth the fact that mortality cannot inherit the kingdom of God, he says:

UMI

"Behold, I shew you a mystery: we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written [in Is. 25: 8], Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." (1 Cor. 15: 51–58.)

BIBLE TEACHING ON THE FINAL PUNISHMENT.[1]

BY THE REV. WILLIS TRUTHLOVER.

[1] The writer of the following pages was brought up in the common belief of the endless, conscious suffering of the wicked, as the true doctrine of the Bible. For the Holy Scriptures he felt, from childhood, a deep reverence, as God's truth revealed to man; and used to read them much, and commit portions of them to memory. When he was enabled to trust in Christ for salvation, he felt to take those precious Scriptures as his supreme rule of faith and practice. Afterward, whatever was proposed to him as a religious doctrine or duty, he endeavored to bring to the Bible test, and in this way to "prove all things," and "hold fast that which is good." (1 Thess. 5: 21.) And since he was first favored with the privilege of access to the inspired Hebrew and Greek, he has prized still more highly the inspiring work of "searching the Scriptures" (John 5: 39), and "proving all things" by them.

To the subject of the Final Punishment, he has given much attention. And the deliberate and thorough examination of the Scriptures with reference to it, has led him to adopt the views which are herein set forth for the aid and benefit of others. May the Lord himself teach us by his word and Spirit, and "guide us into all the truth." (John 16: 13.)

I. The words of the Bible, like those of other books, are to be understood in their ordinary sense, except where the context or known facts show that they cannot be so understood. Or, expressing the same truth in the language of Ernesti, on the principles of Scripture interpretation, as translated by Stuart, "There can be no certainty at all in respect to the interpretation of any passage, unless a kind of necessity compels us to affix a particular sense to a word; which sense must be *one;* and, unless there are special reasons for a tropical meaning, it must be the literal sense."

II. Bearing in mind this fundamental rule, let us turn to the Old Testament, which makes known a system of law, with reward and penalty attached, and near its close, in Mal. 4: 1, we read: "For behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly shall be stubble;

and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch."

The preceding context, respecting the "book of remembrance" written before the Lord for those who feared him and thought on his name, and their being acknowledged as his in the day when he shall "make up his jewels," and its being then clearly "discerned" who are "righteous" and who "wicked," together with the linking of this context with the verse by the particle "for," shows that the day spoken of is that of the final judgment.

"For behold the day cometh that shall *burn.*" How will it burn? "As an oven." "And all the proud, and all that do wickedly"—embracing the whole of the ungodly—"shall be stubble," that is, like the dry stubble, used in ancient times to heat the oven; "and the day that cometh shall *burn them up,*" as the flaming oven burns up the stubble," so that it shall not *leave of them root or branch,* as the burning oven consumes the stubble so thoroughly as to leave of it "neither root nor branch." Here is not an intimation that it is the *happiness,* or the *works,* or the *sins* of the wicked, which shall be burned up. It is plainly declared to be *the wicked themselves* that shall be destroyed; "the day that cometh shall burn *them* up, saith the Lord of hosts." As, then, "the stubble is burned up," in the flaming oven, and becomes extinct forever as stubble; so "all the proud and all that do wickedly shall be burned up," in the day of God's executive judgment, and become *extinct forever as human beings.*

But it is urged: "The description in this verse is couched in figurative language." Some of the language is "figurative." First, "as an oven." This is the figure called "simile," or "comparison;" in which the comparison is expressed by the particle "as." Next, the word "stubble." This is the figure termed "metaphor;" in which the comparing particle "as" or "like" is understood. Lastly, the phrase "neither root nor branch;" which is also metaphor. Neither the context nor known facts require us to understand "burn," and "burn up" in any other than their ordinary sense. (See § 1.)

Besides, in a book of laws, both the law and its penalty are intended to be expressed in plain language, so as to be intelligible. Much more must the Judge of all the earth (Gen. 18: 25), the supremely wise and good, in his statute book use "words easy to be understood" (1 Cor. 14: 9), when defining the penalty which he will execute upon impenitent men in the great and terrible day.

The error of some interpreters, particularly on this subject, is, that they carry the figures *too far*, and represent that as figurative language which the sacred writer did not so intend.

III. "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his threshing floor, and will gather his wheat into the garner; but the chaff will he burn up with fire unquenchable. (Matt. 3: 12.)

This verse is extended metaphor; but can be readily understood by consulting the preceding context. We there find John the Baptist addressing Pharisees and Sadducees, and describing to them the work which the Christ will perform on penitent and impenitent *men*. In the verse before us, the description of this work is continued, in a way which plainly refers it to the judgment day.

"He will thoroughly cleanse his threshing floor;" that is, will thoroughly separate the righteous from the wicked. The word "threshing floor" is here used, by metonomy, for the thing contained—the grain to be "cleansed" from its "chaff." And as the farmer gathers his wheat into the garner, so Christ will gather the righteous into the place he has prepared for them. Finally, as the farmer in Bible times, "burned up the chaff with unquenchable fire," that is, a fire which was kept burning till the chaff was all consumed, so Christ will *burn up* the wicked "with unquenchable fire," in the great day of retribution.

We say, in the ordinary language of life: "The fire burned with such rapidity that it could not be quenched, and the building was entirely consumed." What then? "The fire *went out*." And we never even think of its doing anything else. Also, the building was entirely consumed as a building; so that *as a building it can exist no more forever*. In like manner, in the verse we are considering, as the fire is "unquenchable," so long as any of "the chaff" remains unconsumed, so, in the day of judgment, "the fire" will be, "unquenchable," till the subject of punishment on whom it preys shall be "burned up," or completely *disorganized and destroyed as a human being*.

IV. We are now prepared to comprehend the expression, "the *everlasting* (*aionion*) *fire*," of Matt. 18: 8, and 25: 41. The fire ever lasts, continues without interruption, is "unquenchable," till the subject of punishment is entirely consumed and destroyed, as a conscious, organized, living being. (Comp. § 7, on Matt. 10: 28.)

In Jude 7, "Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them," are declared to be "set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of *eternal* (*aionion*) fire." Their case then, affords "an example," or specimen of the manner in which God will deal with the finally impenitent. The agent employed to destroy them, was the devouring fire; and in like manner, as we saw in § 2 and 3, in the judgment day fire will be the destroying agent which God will employ. It is called "*eternal* fire," because it *continued without interruption* (see Webster's Quarto *Dict.*), and was unquenchable, till those cities and their wicked inhabitants were totally destroyed; so that as those identical cities they can *never exist again*.

V. "It is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having the two hands to go into hell (*gehenna*), into the fire that is unquenchable; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." (Mark 9: 43, 44.) "It is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire [*eis ten gehennan tou puros*, into the gehenna of fire]; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." (vv. 47, 48.)

The expressions, "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," were evidently derived from Is. 66: 24: "And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorrence to all flesh." By "*their* worm" and "*their* fire," in this passage, we are to understand, the worm that feeds upon, and the fire that burns "the carcasses of the men who have transgressed," and in v. 16 we read, "The *slain* of the Lord shall be many." So that the expressions, "their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched," must be taken with the understood restriction, as long as those dead bodies, or any portions of them, *shall remain to be consumed*. The prominent idea, then, conveyed by these expressions is, *the certain and complete destruction* of the enemies of the Lord, when he shall come to execute judgment. (See vv. 13–24.)

South of Jerusalem was the Valley of Hinnom, called in Hebrew *Ge Hinnom*, where infants were formerly burned in the fire as a sacrifice to Molech, and into which dead bodies and the offals of the city were brought to be buried or burned up.[1] It thus became pre-eminently a place of defilement and *destruction*, and was regarded with abhorrence. Hence the later Jews applied its name *Ge Hinnom*, to the place of final punishment, into which the wicked will be "cast" and "destroyed." (Matt. 10: 28.)

[1] See 2 Chron. 28: 3; 2 Kings 23: 10. Jer. 7: 31, 32; 19: 6-13; 32: 35; Is. 30: 30-33.

This word *gehenna*, properly translated "hell" in the New Testament, occurs three times in Mark 9: 43–48, in immediate connection with the expressions we are considering. When Jesus, therefore, employed these expressions, he could not have expected or intended to convey to his Jewish hearers the idea of *preservation in misery*, with "the fire" *forever burning*, and "their worm" *forever gnawing and torturing* the agonizing and helpless victims, but must have conveyed the idea of the *inevitable and complete destruction* of sinful, impenitent men! Who should not immediately heed the fearful warning?

"Into the fire that never shall be quenched," of vv 43, 45, in the common version, is a mistranslation. It should read, as in the revised New Testament published by the American Bible Union, "into the fire that is unquenchable," *eis to pur to asbeston*.

VI. "The wicked shall *perish*, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall *consume*, into *smoke* shall they *consume away*." (Ps. 37: 20.)

To a Jew, accustomed to see the fat of the sacrificial lamb, on the altar of burnt-offering, "consume away into smoke," these words must have given a very distinct and vivid idea of the *utter destruction* of the wicked.

VII. "And be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to *destroy both soul and body in hell*," *en gehenna*, "in gehenna." (Matt. 10: 28.)

Here is direct proof, in addition to what we found in § 5, from the lips of our Savior, that hell, *gehenna*, is a place, not of preservation, but of *destruction*—destruction of the life and being of those who are judicially cast into it—*destruction of both soul and body!*"

VIII. "Who shall be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." (2 Thess. 1: 9.)

The revised New Testament like the Greek, reads, "who shall suffer justice, eternal destruction from the presence of the Lord," etc.

The destruction is "everlasting," or "eternal" (*aionion*), because it is final, and brings those who undergo it into a condition from which they can *never be recovered*. Comp. Ps. 92: 7.

> "When the wicked spring up as the grass,
> And all the workers of iniquity flourish,
> It is that they may be *destroyed forever*."

This "justice" or "eternal destruction," proceeds from the presence and glorious power of the Lord; just as "there came fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat;" as "there came out fire from the Lord, and devoured" Nadab and Abihu, "and they died before the Lord;" and as "there came out fire from the Lord, and consumed the two hundred and fifty men that offered incense"—Korah and his company. (Lev. 9: 24; 10: 2; Num. 16: 35. See also 2 Chron. 7: 1; Rev. 20: 9.)

IX. "And these shall go away into everlasting (*aionion*) punishment; but the righteous into everlasting (*aionion*) life." (Matt. 25: 46.)

The word employed to set forth the penal condition, or retribution, into which the unrighteous go away, is not misery, but *punishment*. Under human governments, a criminal is punished—capitally punished, when he is put to death; and when he is dead, his conscious, physical suffering, or misery ceases. But his punishment, in its disgrace, and in its *completely cutting him off from this life*, remains, and will *forever* remain. So the final punishment of the wicked, in its *completely cutting them off from the future life* and its blessings, will be *everlasting*, just as really as the life awarded to the righteous, and its attendant blessings, will be everlasting.

Compare the expression "eternal (*aionion*) judgment" in Heb. 6: 2. These words, following as they do "the resurrection of the dead," must refer to the sentence executed "in the day of judgment," which is a limited time. Therefore they cannot mean a judgment that is *forever going on*, but must mean, that judgment which is final, irreversible, and eternal, because it fixes forever the retribution and state of those who are judged.

X. "And the smoke of their torment goes up forever and ever; and they have no rest day and night, who worship the beast and his image, and whoever receives the mark of his name." (Rev. 14: 11.) "And the devil who misleads them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where are also the beast and the false prophet; and they shall be tormented day and night forever and ever." (ch. 20: 10.)

These obscure predictions of most important events, are illustrated by Is. 34: 9, 10, as with a calcium light: "And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up forever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it forever and ever."

Jehovah, through the prophet Isaiah, is here foretelling the terrible destruction and desolation which he will bring on "the land of Edom," or "Idumea," for their sins against him and his people. See vv. 5–10. The last half of v. 10, commencing with

"from generation," is in literal language, and has been fulfilled to the letter, as is attested by reliable travelers, who have looked upon the Idumean desolations. And this literal part explains the glowing and highly wrought metaphorical portion. With this divine key to unlock the meaning, what languge could more vividly depict a *complete destruction;* a perpetual, everlasting desolation? See vv. 11, 12. Compare Jude 7, in § 4.

Now turn back to the verses from Revelation, and we read: "Cast into the lake of fire and *brimstone.*" In Isaiah we find: "Shall be turned into *pitch,*" "brimstone," "*burning pitch.*" In Revelation "*The smoke* of their torment *goes up forever and ever,*" they shall be tormented *forever and ever;*" in Isaiah, "The *smoke* thereof *shall go up forever.*" In Revelation, "They have no rest *day and night,*" "they shall be tormented *day and night;*" in Isaiah, "It shall uot be quenched *night nor day.*"

We have seen, that in Isaiah these strong metaphorical expressions are employed to foretell, not the preservation, but the *complete destruction* and perpetual desolation of a habitable land. And what is this but the *destruction of its being*, or existence, *as a habitable land?* When, therefore, these prophetical expressions are employed in the New Testament, they must convey the same fundamental idea of destruction of being. One of them is most clearly so used in Rev. 19: 3—"And her smoke goes up forever and ever." But in ch. 18: 8, 21, we are told: "She shall be *burned up* with fire;" "and shall *be found no more.*" This example affords inspired, corroborative proof of the principle above stated. Thus we find these two verses from Revelation, when interpreted by a like class of Scriptures, entirely harmonizing with the passages we previously examined.

The expression, "shall be *tormented* forever and ever," should be compared with Ps. 83: 14, 15, 17:

> "As the fire burneth a wood,
> And as the flame sets the mountains on fire;
> So persecute them with thy tempest,
> And make them afraid with thy storm."[1]
> Let them be confounded and troubled *forever;*
> Yea, let them be put to shame, and *perish.*"

The last two of these lines form a Hebrew poetic parallelism, the latter of which explains the meaning of the former, and shows it to be like this: "Let them be confounded and troubled forever," that is, as long as *their consciousness shall last*, even until they shall "*perish!*" The brief explanation of Rev. 14: 11, and 20: 10, at which we now arrive is this: "They shall be tormented," "the smoke of their torment goes up," as long as their consciousness lasts and they are capable of experiencing torment even until they perish, are burned up, and shall be found no more!"

[1] See Ps. 11: 6.

XI. "And in hell [*en to hade*] he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." "I am tormented in this flame." "This place of torment." (Luke 16: 23, 24, 28.)

These verses have been referred to as proof, that the wicked will be in a state of conscious suffering in hell forever. But the Greek word here translated "hell," in the common version, is not *gehenna*, the place of final punishment, properly translated "hell," but *hades*, the underworld, the abode of the dead. Besides, these "torments" are said to be endured by the rich man "in the underworld," after he "died and was buried," and while he has "five brothers" still in their "lifetime" at his "father's house" on earth, to which he requests that Lazarus may be sent to "testify to them," and where they can "hear Moses and the prophets" read, take the warning, and obey God, so that they may not also come into this place of torment." The judgment day has not yet come. Therefore these torments endured by the rich man in "the underworld,"[1] are not those which the wicked will endure "in the day of judgment." (Matt. 11: 22, 24.) Much less are they to be endured *after* the judgment day. Yet this brief and pointed narrative does show the impossibility of an impenitent man being saved from his sins and their fearful consequences, after he closes the present life.

XII. "The Lord preserveth all that love him;
But all the wicked he will destroy." (Ps. 145: 20.)

The *destruction* of all the wicked is here placed in direct contrast with the *preservation* of all the righteous, who "love" God. Therefore, while the righteous will be preserved unto life eternal, the wicked will be destroyed, and thus be forever *cut off* from life.

> "Thou hast rebuked the heathen, thou hast *destroyed* the wicked,
> Thou hast *put out their name forever and ever.*" (Ps. 9: 5.)
> "Thy hand will find out all thine enemies,
> Thy right hand will find out those that hate thee.
> Thou wilt make them as a *fiery oven* in the time of thine anger;
> Jehovah will *swallow them up* in his wrath, and *the fire shall devour them.*"
> (Ps. 21: 8, 9.)

[1] "The underworld" itself and "death" are both to be *destroyed* in the judgment day, so far as the human race are concerned. See Rev. 20: 14; and § 13.

"Evil doers shall be *cut off*."
"Yet a little while and the wicked *shall not be*."
"The wicked shall *perish*."
"The transgressors shall be *destroyed* together.
"The end of the wicked shall be *cut off*." (Ps. 37: 9, 10, 20, 38.)

"Surely thou didst set them in slippery places,
Thou castedst them down *into destruction*.
How are they brought into desolation as in a moment!
They are *utterly consumed* with terrors." (Ps. 73: 18, 19.)
"For lo, they that are far from thee *shall perish*;
Thou wilt *destroy* all that go lewdly from thee." (v. 27.)

"*Destruction* shall be to the workers of iniquity." (Prov. 10: 29.)
"He that being often reproved, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be *destroyed*, and that without remedy." (ch. 29: 1.)
"And it shall be that every soul that will not hear that Prophet, shall be *utterly destroyed* from among the people." (Acts 3: 23.)
"As many as sinned without law, shall also *perish* without law." (Rom. 2: 12.)
"These....shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption, receiving the wages of unrighteousness. (2 Pet. 2: 12, 13.)

"The time of the dead to be judged, and to give the reward to thy servants....; and to *destroy* those who destroy the earth." (Rev. 11: 18.)

God made the earth to be inhabited" (Is. 45: 18), and to minister to the wants, happiness, and permanent welfare of mankind. Whoever, therefore, use their power and influence to destroy it as such, must in turn be *destroyed*, in the great day of reckoning.

XIII. "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely *die*." (Gen. 2: 17.)

In the very day that Adam and Eve ate thereof, they did become subject to death as transgressors of the law, and liable to have that death penalty executed on them at any moment.

"The soul that sinneth, it shall *die*." (Ezek. 18: 4, 20.) "The wages of sin is *death*." (Rom. 6: 23.)
"He that overcomes shall not be *hurt* by the *second death*." (Rev. 2: 11.) "On these the *second death* has no power." [ch. 20: 6.] "This is the *second death*, the lake of fire. And if any one was not found written in the book of life, he was cast into the lake of fire." (vv. 14, 15.) "Idolaters, and all the liars shall have their part in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone, which is the *second death*." (ch. 21: 8.)

The word "death" means *the extinction of life*. (See Webster's and Worcester's smaller dictionaries.) This definition is confirmed by universal observation. In the second death, or the first installment of death, the *body* dies. In the second death, they that have done evil having come forth to the resurrection of judgment (*kriseos*) "both *soul and body die*; being "burned up" and "destroyed in hell," the "fire unquenchable," the "furnace

of fire," the "lake of fire," by the almighty power of a wise, just, and holy God. Thus, to the finally impenitent, our God will indeed be "a consuming fire." (John 5: 29; Matt. 10: 28; 3: 12; 13: 42, 50; Mal. 4: 1; Rev. 20: 14, 15; Deut. 4: 24; 9: 3; Heb. 12: 29.)

XIV. God "will render *to every man according to his deeds*;... to those who are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and distress, upon every soul of man that worketh evil." (Rom. 2: 6-9.)

And he will do this in the day of wrath and of the revelation of his righteous judgment; in the day when God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ. (vv. 5, 16.)

"It shall be more tolerable [more easy to be endured] for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city." (Matt. 10: 15.) "It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment, than for you," Chorazin and Bethsaida;—"than for thee," Capernaum. (ch. 11: 22, 24.)
"Who devour widow's houses, and for a pretense make long prayers; these shall receive the greater condemnation." (Mark 12: 40.)

These passages show that the second death, or being destroyed in hell (Matt. 10: 28), is accompanied with *tribulation*, and *distress*, or *torment*. (Rev. 14: 11.) And distress or torment admits of *degrees*; so that it will be more tolerable to the less guilty, and will be greater, as a judgment or condemnation, to the more guilty. See also Luke 20: 18; 12: 47, 48.

XV. The words DIE, DEATH, DESTROY, DESTRUCTION, PERISH, LOSE, LOST, PERDITION, CONSUME, BURN UP, and DEVOUR, are used in the Bible about eighteen hundred times, and in eight hundred and fifty of those instances, they either describe, or directly or indirectly indicate, the final destiny of the impenitent. Other expressions also as decidedly declare it; such as "dash in pieces," "slay," "be cut off," "shall not be," "tear in pieces," "cut asunder," "grind to powder." (Ps. 2: 9; 34: 21; 37: 9, 10; 50: 22; Matt. 24: 51; 21: 44.)

If we, therefore, understand that destiny to be, as thus so many times and with such a variety of expressions pointed out, that the wicked will die, undergo the second death, will utterly perish, be utterly destroyed, destroyed forever, be burned up, like the chaff, and like the stubble, so as to have left of them neither root nor branch; then the language is intelligible, the Scriptures are indeed a revelation (Deut. 29: 29)—making known our future destiny clearly, according to our character and

works, the Bible appears consistent and harmonious on the subject throughout, and a strong prop, which has given much support to Universalism and Infidelity, is taken away.

XVI. If we consult *analogy*, it leads to the same result. For we see that vegetation comes to maturity, and then decays and perishes. And the animals mature, and attain their full size and strength, and from that point decline, and sooner or later die. Thus both the vegetable and the animal tribes fill their appointed place, and accomplish their Maker's design, and then pass away. And we find man equally subject to this universal law of tendency toward ripeness, or full development, and then toward decay and death; and in the grave his body is *consumed*. (See Ps. 49: 14.) This surely does not indicate the *preservation* of the wicked, who fail to accomplish the end for which man was created! (See Gen. 1: 26, 27; Ps. 17: 15; 1 Cor. 10: 31.)

Good governmental policy also brings us to the same conclusion. For, if the wicked are to live on forever in their enmity and opposition to God, then they will forever persist in their rebellion against him. And their forever remaining thus in rebellion, would seem to imply *weakness* on the part of God, and *inability to subdue rebellion*, and to banish it from his dominions! Can it be right for us to cling to a system of doctrine, which, in its logical sequences, thus attributes weakness and inability to the Almighty? "Is anything too hard for Jehovah?" (Gen. 18: 14.) Will not "the Lord Jesus with the breath of his mouth consume the Lawless One, and with the manifestation of his coming *destroy* him?" (2 Thess. 2: 8, Rev. N. T.) And must not Christ "reign" in the exercise of his Mediatorial authority, "till he hath put all enemies under his feet," and "subjected all things?" (1 Cor. 15: 25, 26.) Where, then, at the close of that period, can one rebel be left, unsubjected or undestroyed?

XVII. "From a careful examination of the Scriptures themselves, I have now endeavored to ascertain and present their teaching respecting the final punishment of all the impenitent. And in view of the conclusion to which we have been brought, sustained also by analogy and good governmental policy, it appears to me consistent with the wisdom, justice, and goodness of God, with his design in forming the earth and man (see Is. 45: 12, 17, 18.), and with the declarations and principles of his word, that the incorrigibly sinful, who will not have Christ to reign over and save them (Luke 19: 14), should be "*punished according to their sins and individual desert, as estimated by God himself;* and that this should result in the CLEANSING OF HIS UNIVERSE FROM BOTH THEM AND THEIR WORKS, and its retaining only purity and righteousness, and those who practice righteousness. This most desirable consummation accords with the inspired petitions of the Psalmist:

> "Oh, let the wickedness of the wicked *come to an end!*
> But establish the righteous." (Ps. 7: 9.)
>
> "Let THE SINNERS BE CONSUMED OUT OF THE EARTH
> And let the WICKED BE NO MORE!" (Ps. 104: 35.)

It also accords with the inspired declarations of the apostle (Col. 1; 19: 20): "HE was pleased,....through him [Christ] to *reconcile all things to himself*, having made peace through the blood of his cross; through him, whether the things on the earth, or the things in the heavens." That is, I apprehend, when Christ's work as Mediator is completed, *nothing will be left on the earth*, or in the heavens surrounding the earth, that is *unreconciled to God!* And "then comes the end, when he delivers up the kingdom to God, the Father"—the Mediatorial kingdom; "when he shall have *done away all rule, and all authority and power*," opposed to God. "For he must reign," as Mediatorial King, "till he has *put all enemies under his feet*." (1 Cor. 15: 24, 25.)

It is likewise in harmony with that ancient prediction respecting the absolute power of Christ over his incorrigible enemies:

> "Ask of me,
> And I will give the nations as thy inheritance,
> And the utmost parts of the earth as thy possession.
> Thou shalt rule them with a rod of iron;
> Thou shalt *dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.*" [Ps. 2: 8, 9.]

Whatever, then, shall *remain*,[1] on the earth or in the heavens around the earth, will have been subjected, and reconciled to God, by his Son. And whoever shall have continued in rebellion, and refused to submit and be reconciled, shall be *destroyed*—dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel in the great day. Oh! what impeitent man can stand when Christ shall come and execute the final judgment! (Rev. 6: 15–17.)

XVIII. It may be asked: "If such is really the teaching of the Bible on this subject, whence came the idea of the endless, conscious suffering of the wicked, which now so generally pre-

[1] Compare Heb. 12: 27.

UMI

vails in the Christian churches?"

It seems to have originated from the introduction into the churches, from the latter part of the second century and onward, of the Platonic philosophy respecting the nature and immortality of the human soul, by such writers and teachers as Justin Martyr, Clement, of Alexandria, and Origen. The reasoning appears to have been like this: Since the soul is an emanation from God, and is in its nature immortal, and is now merely imprisoned in the body for a time, the everlasting punishment of the wicked, spoken of in the Holy Scripture, must consist in their enduring eternal, conscious suffering, or everlasting torment, in hell. These ideas having become prevalent in the churches, the Romish priesthood seem to have considered it for their interest to perpetuate them. Protestants also, at the Reformation, accepted them as the commonly received opinions, and have since aided to give them currency.

XIX. "And the Lord God formed the man of the dust of the ground; and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living soul." [Gen. 2: 7.]

This passage has been referred to as proof of the innate and necessary immortality of the human soul, and consequently of the eternal, conscious suffering of the wicked. But the Hebrew words *nephesh chayah*, here translated "a living soul," are, in ch. 1, applied also to the *brute animals* of the sea and land, which God created. "Let the waters swarm with swarms of *living beings*." (v. 21.) "And God created the great sea monsters, and every *living being* that moves, with which the waters swarm." (v. 21.) "Let the earth bring forth the *living being* after its kind, cattle and reptile and beast of the earth, after its kind." (v. 24.) "And to every thing that creeps on the earth, wherein is a *spirit of life*." (v. 30.)

In harmony with the above, ch. 2: 7, might also be rendered, "and the man became a *living being*." If, then, it is still insisted that "a living soul," [*nephesh chayah*] must denote the innate and necessary immortality of the human soul; it must also denote the innate and necessary *immortality of the spirit of the brutes*, to all of which it is applied the same as to man. The statement, "He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life," does not necessarily imply more than God's ANIMATING HIM WITH A PRINCIPLE OF LIFE, so that he became a living being. (Comp. John 20: 22.)

Man, then, was not made necessarily immortal. Yet he was created *with a view to immortality*; as, among other things, we may infer from God's providing "the tree of life in the midst of the garden" for him to eat of. (Gen. 2: 9, 16. See also 1: 26, 27.) By transgression, he cut himself off from the privilege of thus growing into immortality, and brought himself under the positive sentence of death. And now he can obtain immortality, or eternal life, only through the atoning and life-giving Redeemer. (2 Tim. 1: 10; 3: 15; John 3: 16, 36.)

THE DAVIDIC COVENANT.

BY AN ADVENTIST.

"An everlasting covenant.... even the sure mercies of David. (Is. 55: 3.)

These words are referred by Paul to the resurrection of Jesus Christ (Acts 13: 34), which event is the pledge of all our hopes relating to a future life, both as regards existence or enjoyment: for, says the same apostle, "if Christ be not raised our faith is vain," we "are yet in our sins," and even those who so trustfully fell asleep in Jesus, expecting the better resurrection to eternal life, "are perished." We know that Christ "died according to the Scriptures;" but unless he be risen again the world is in as hopeless condition as before. (1 Cor. 15: 12–19.) Therefore Paul could say—"We declare unto you *glad tidings*, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, *in that he hath raised up Jesus again*; as it is also written in the second Psalm: Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. And as concerning that he *raised him up from the dead*, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you *the sure mercies of David*."

All the promises of God in Christ are established by his resurrection; but in this chapter it is proposed to trace but one of them—that embodied in the following language, which immediately succeeds the assurance of "an everlasting covenant, even the sure mercies of David," viz.: "I have given him for.... a leader and commander to the people." "The sure mercies of David" include a God-given ruler, or king, to occupy his throne, as will appear in this investigation of the covenant with him.

UMI

vails in the Christian churches?"

It seems to have originated from the introduction into the churches, from the latter part of the second century and onward, of the Platonic philosophy respecting the nature and immortality of the human soul, by such writers and teachers as Justin Martyr, Clement, of Alexandria, and Origen. The reasoning appears to have been like this: Since the soul is an emanation from God, and is in its nature immortal, and is now merely imprisoned in the body for a time, the everlasting punishment of the wicked, spoken of in the Holy Scripture, must consist in their enduring eternal, conscious suffering, or everlasting torment, in hell. These ideas having become prevalent in the churches, the Romish priesthood seem to have considered it for their interest to perpetuate them. Protestants also, at the Reformation, accepted them as the commonly received opinions, and have since aided to give them currency.

XIX. "And the Lord God formed the man of the dust of the ground; and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living soul." [Gen. 2: 7.]

This passage has been referred to as proof of the innate and necessary immortality of the human soul, and consequently of the eternal, conscious suffering of the wicked. But the Hebrew words *nephesh chayah*, here translated "a living soul," are, in ch. 1, applied also to the *brute animals* of the sea and land, which God created. "Let the waters swarm with swarms of *living beings*." (v. 21.) "And God created the great sea monsters, and every *living being* that moves, with which the waters swarm." (v. 21.) "Let the earth bring forth the *living being* after its kind, cattle and reptile and beast of the earth, after its kind." (v. 24.) "And to every thing that creeps on the earth, wherein is a *spirit of life*." (v. 30.)

In harmony with the above, ch. 2: 7, might also be rendered, "and the man became a *living being*." If, then, it is still insisted that "a living soul," [*nephesh chayah*] must denote the innate and necessary immortality of the human soul; it must also denote the innate and necessary *immortality of the spirit of the brutes*, to all of which it is applied the same as to man. The statement, "He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life," does not necessarily imply more than God's ANIMATING HIM WITH A PRINCIPLE OF LIFE, so that he became a living being. (Comp. John 20: 22.)

Man, then, was not made necessarily immortal. Yet he was created *with a view to immortality*; as, among other things, we may infer from God's providing "the tree of life in the midst of the garden" for him to eat of. (Gen. 2: 9, 16. See also 1: 26, 27.) By transgression, he cut himself off from the privilege of thus growing into immortality, and brought himself under the positive sentence of death. And now he can obtain immortality, or eternal life, only through the atoning and life-giving Redeemer. (2 Tim. 1: 10; 3: 15; John 3: 16, 36.)

THE DAVIDIC COVENANT.

BY AN ADVENTIST.

"An everlasting covenant.... even the sure mercies of David. (Is. 55: 3.)

These words are referred by Paul to the resurrection of Jesus Christ (Acts 13: 34), which event is the pledge of all our hopes relating to a future life, both as regards existence or enjoyment: for, says the same apostle, "if Christ be not raised our faith is vain," we "are yet in our sins," and even those who so trustfully fell asleep in Jesus, expecting the better resurrection to eternal life, "are perished." We know that Christ "died according to the Scriptures;" but unless he be risen again the world is in as hopeless condition as before. (1 Cor. 15: 12–19.) Therefore Paul could say—"We declare unto you *glad tidings*, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, *in that he hath raised up Jesus again*; as it is also written in the second Psalm: Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. And as concerning that he *raised him up from the dead*, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you *the sure mercies of David*."

All the promises of God in Christ are established by his resurrection; but in this chapter it is proposed to trace but one of them—that embodied in the following language, which immediately succeeds the assurance of "an everlasting covenant, even the sure mercies of David," viz.: "I have given him for....a leader and commander to the people." "The sure mercies of David" include a God-given ruler, or king, to occupy his throne, as will appear in this investigation of the covenant with him.

UMI

This covenant is recorded in the following terms (Ps. 89: 3, 4, 19, 20, 28–37): "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, *Thy seed will I establish forever*, and build up thy throne *to all generations*....Thou spakest in vision to thy Holy One, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out of the people. I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him....My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven.

"If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips.

"Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His *seed shall endure forever*, and *his throne as the sun* before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven."

It will be observed that some of the articles of this covenant are strictly conditional, while others are equally unconditional. The blessings promised to David's children are contingent upon their obedienee; while disobedience would insure punishment. That David so understood it appears in his charge to Solomon, to obey God and walk in his ways "that the Lord may continue his word which he spake concerning me, saying, If thy children take heed to their way, to walk before me in truth, with all their heart, and with all their soul, there shall not fail thee (said he) a man on the throne of Israel." (1 Ki. 2: 4.) And Solomon recognizes the same contingency. "There shall not fail thee a man in my sight to sit on the throne of Israel, so that [Marg., only if; or, that is, if] thy children take heed to their way, that they walk before me as thou hast walked before me." (1 Ki. 8: 25.)

But the Davidic covenant involved something more permanent and more glorious than the conditional continuance of the Jewish polity in the land of Palestine. Like the promise to Abram, it lays hold upon immortality and incorruption. Though David's natural heirs might, as indeed they did, bring upon

themselves a curse instead of blessings, yet something sure remained for David and his "seed." God not only promised, but sware by his holiness, that David's *seed* should be established forever, and his *throne* be built up to all generations, and endure as the sun and moon forever. From this language we infer that the *seed* promised to the King of Israel is the same that is mentioned in the threat to the serpent (Gen. 3: 15), and also, in the covenant with Abraham. (Gen. 13: 15; Gal. 3: 16.) That this inference is a just one, will appear hereinafter.

The history of David's descendants is so well known that we need not cite the proof that they failed to comply with conditions by virtue of which only could they continue to occupy his throne and kingdom. They forsook the Lord, and he, after bearing with their perversity, at last forsook them. His wrath was provoked "until there was no remedy;" and then Ezekiel denounced to King Zedekiah the impending doom: "And thou profane, wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God: Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him." (ch. 21; 25–27.)

David's throne was overturned, but in the midst of deserved wrath, mercy was remembered. The prophet avers that the subverted throne is not ntterly or forever overthrown, but is held in reserve until an heir with indefeasable right shall "come" to lay claim to the royal seat. God will recognize the claim as valid, restore David's scepter, give it to him whose right it is; and *this* "seed shall endure forever, and *his* throne as the days of heaven."

This rightful occupant of David's throne is sometimes spoken of, in type, as David himself, as in Ezek. 34, where we read: "Therefore will I save my flock, and they shall no more be a prey; and I will judge between cattle and cattle. And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them; I the Lord have spoken it." In John 10: 11–18, we learn who is meant by "my servant David," the "shepherd" of God's people. "I am the good shepherd, says Christ; and "there shall be one fold and one shepherd." (Comp. Rev. 7: 17; 21: 3.)

UMI

Again in ch. 37: 24, after describing the gathering of "the whole house of Israel" into their promised inheritance, by means of their resurrection (for this vision relates to a literal and not a spiritual resurrection), it is said: "And David my servant shall be king over them; and they shall *all have* ONE SHEPHERD. By comparing this with above citations, it will be seen that there is no escape from the conclusion that here, again, the reign of Christ is announced. In the next verse the anti-typical David is presented as the everlasting Prince of God's children; and as this is when God's tabernacle is with them, it must be in the new earth state; for not until then will it be said, "The tabernacle of God is with men." (Rev. 21: 3.)

Another holy man of God, moved by his Spirit, predicts the restoration of David's throne, and the elevation of the rightful heir to his dominion in the following strain: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, [or, Father of the everlasting Age], the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, *upon the throne of David*, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to *establish it* with judgment and with justice from henceforth even *forever*. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." (Is. 9: 6, 7.)

Jeremiah thus announces the Prince of the house of David: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch [*tsemach*—offspring], and a King shall reign and prosper, and execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely. And this is his name, whereby he shall be called: The Lord our Righteousness." (ch. 23: 5, 6.)

Of all the offspring of David of one only is, or could it be said, that he is made unto us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption;" and this is Christ Jesus. (1 Cor. 1: 30.) Hence it follows, as Jeremiah's prediction is not yet fulfilled, that at some future time Christ must "reign.....IN THE EARTH." The claim, which some have set up, that this refers to a purely spiritual reign, is forever debarred by the fact that the prophecies relating to the Messiah already fulfilled, have in each case been literally accomplished. This is God's precedent, established for our learning. Who is he that will set it aside by spiritualizing prophecy whose fulfillment is in the future?

As the fullness of time drew near, when God purposed to send his Son into the world as the promised seed of Abraham and heir to David's throne, an angel appeared to Mary, and said: "Behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." (Lk. 1: 31–33.)

All admit that the first clauses of the annunciation were literally fulfilled. The conception, birth, and naming of Jesus were all literal. It is also literally true that he is great, and is called the Son of the Highest. By what principle of interpretation, then, may we assume that his "throne," "reign," and "kingdom," are to be not literally, but mystically understood, of a spiritual throne. reign, and kingdom? Yet a most distinguished modern commentator [Lange] does not hesitate to tell us concerning the above passage—"The announcement of his universal spiritual reign would have been, at this time, even more incomprehensible to Mary. It lies *hidden*, however, in the promise—*Of his kingdom there shall be no end.* We must regard these words of the angel as an *accommodation merely* to the exclusively Jewish expectations then prevailing concerning the kingdom of Messiah." That is to say, the Jews having fallen into an error, the angel of God adopts language *calculated to confirm them in that error!* Moreover, the expression referred to is a direct quotation from the prophet Daniel. Are we to infer that God speaking through him, also, spake the words "as an accommodation merely" to Jewish prejudices? And what possible ground is there for the cool assumption that in the words "Of his kingdom there shall be no end"—the strongest possible language to express a dominion of eternal duration—the "angel '*hid*' an announcement of Christ's universal spiritual reign?" Such theological conceits are the natural offspring of a system which interprets *life* to mean happiness, *perish* to mean preserve, and *death* to mean existence in anguish.

It is a great mistake to suppose that the error of the Jews which led them to reject their Messiah was *literalism*. Their prophets foretold "the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." (1 Pet. 1: 11.) And the first, especially, were prefigured by a thousand rites in their law. Had they been true

UMI

literalists they would have looked for a suffering as well as a glorified Redeemer. They would have seen, as the prophets did, in their continual sacrifices, the anti-typical, and literal, sacrifice of the Lamb of God, who, pouring out his soul unto death, should take away the sin of the world: nor could they in the very hour of the celebration of the typical passover, have slain the anti-type, the true Passover, even Christ, who is our Life. Nor will it seem consistent to denounce as *literalists* those who refused to perceive the accomplishment of prophecy in events which daily before their eyes fulfilled their Scriptures to the very "jot and tittle."

The Jews were not wrong in looking for a literal king and kingdom, but they misapprehended the *nature* of the promised dominion. The prophecies of the coming glory and reign of Messiah as David's heir, misapplied to a state of mortality, to a condition of flesh and blood, were dwelt upon to the exclusion of the predictions of those sufferings which must necessarily precede the promised glory. They forgot that 'the heel' of the seed of the the woman must first be 'bruised,' before the devil and his works could be destroyed--the serpent's head be crushed. (Heb. 2: 14.) Predictions of the resurrection state were applied to expected *temporal* glory. They failed to perceive that the promised restitution was to be in the world to come; that David's throne was reserved for "the Lord our righteousness," after that he should rise from the dead; that the gathering of Israel was to be by the rising from the dead; that God had not purposed to set up his kingdom in an earth resting under the curse, to be peopled with dying subjects, but would, as Isaiah foretold, "create new heaven and new earth," where there should be "no more curse," where the anti-typical David should reign forever.

A late writer has well said :[1]

"The nearer we can keep to a clear, definite, and literal interpretation of the Bible, the safer we are. A careful examination of all the fulfilled prophecies cannot fail to convince any one of this fact. Take, for example, those touching the first advent; and did their fulfillment show that any of them were to be understood as mere figures of speech? Did they terminate in anything short of a literal accomplishment, even when of such a nature as would have seemed impossible?

"It was predicted that Christ should be born of a virgin; that he should be called out of Egypt; that he should ride upon the colt "on which man never sat;" that he should be reproached,

[1] L. C. Collins. *Advent Christian Quarterly*, Vol. 1, pp. 31–33.

and afflicted; led as a lamb to the slaughter; be scourged, condemned, and put to death. Yet what a literal fulfillment do we have of these prophecies, as also of all the minute details of his crucifixion, burial, and resurrection!

"And if prophecy failed in nothing of a literal fulfillment touching his humiliation, his sufferings, and death, why should it fail of this, pertaining to his glory? If Peter stood terribly rebuked when in reference to his suffering death he said, 'This be far from thee, Lord;' may not we also be, should we say the same respecting the literal establishment of his kingdom and reign? If the deep humiliation was kept to the very letter of the word, why not the great exaltation and glory? If to fulfill the prophecy, he shall make 'his grave' with 'the rich in his death,' the Son of God must die, and lay his lifeless form in the dark, cold tomb of Joseph, how shall that prophecy be fulfilled which says, 'The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David: he will not turn from it: Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne?' (Ps. 132: 11.) When 'this same Jesus' that was taken up into heaven 'shall so come in like manner as he went into heaven' (Acts 1: 11), and there shall be given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom (Dan. 7: 14), may he not 'according to the flesh' (Acts 2: 30), that is as the legal heir, sit upon 'the throne of his father David, and reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there be no end?' (Luke 1: 32, 33.)

"The latter is predicted with a clearness and precision far exceeding the former, with no intimation but what it will be just as actual. The fact that Christ ascended bodily to heaven 'with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature,'[1] that the heavens now retain him, and that he will come again in his glorified humanity, is a fact more than suggestive of an ulterior design yet to be accomplished. Christ will be in his kingdom bodily: and 'if nothing else gave locality to heaven,' as Richard Watson says, 'this would.'

"With Christ's kingdom then a locality, and he a king descended from the royal house of David, with the Father's oath giving him David's throne; and his coming, and reign and kingdom, all synchronizing together, should it not awake an earnest inquiry whether these things are all to culminate in mere figures of speech; or whether when he comes and 'swallows up death in victory,' he will not personally over the true Israel 'reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously?' (Is. 24: 23.)"

But we have indubitable evidence that the prediction that the Divine Son of Mary should sit upon the throne of David was intended to be literally understood, and had no reference to a spiritual reign in the hearts of his people—a reign that from the days of righteous Abel, who testified his faith by his offering—

[1] Meth. Dis., Art. 3.

UMI

to the present, has never been, nor ever will be suspended. The dominion destined for the Second Adam has been invaded, and his domain occupied by usurpers. But he will yet erect his throne, and personally reign on the earth forever.

In his Pentecostal sermon (Acts 2 : 30, 31), Peter affirms of David, that "being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the *fruit of his loins* ACCORDING TO THE FLESH, he would raise up Christ TO SIT ON HIS THRONE, he, seeing this before spake of *the resurrection* of Christ." And Paul says of Christ, that he "was made of the seed of David *according to the flesh*, and declared to be the Son of God with power....by *the resurrection* from the dead." Can language more clearly express the thought that David looked for one among his offspring "according to the flesh," who by a resurrection to immortality, should be prepared to occupy "his throne forever." And said Jesus, "*I* am the Root and Offspring of David." "I am he that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive forever more." (Rev. 22 : 16; 1 : 18.)

"All hail the great Immanuel's name,
Let angels prostrate fall;
Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown him Lord of all."

We have seen that Christ was born to be a king. He confessed this before Pontius Pilate; but added—"My kingdom is *not of this world:* if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews. But now is my kingdom *not from hence.*" These words contain no renunciation of his claims to royalty, though they compel us to look to another age, and a world to come, for the era and locality of his dominion. Nor are we left to blind conjecture concerning its epoch and territorial situation: the great facts concerning both are definitely revealed. The early church understood them. Peter directs brethren how to make their calling and election sure, and says—"If ye do these things ye shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be administered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." (2 Pet. 1: 10, 11.) He surely did not mean that they should have an abundance entrance into themselves, nor into the church, of which they were already exemplary members. Neither could he have referred to a realm of happy spirits in heaven, to be entered at death, because we can find no reference to such a kingdom in the Scriptures. The kingdom promised

could have been no other than that previously spoken of by the prophets; which so far from being *in* heaven, "or beyond the bounds of space,' is to be "UNDER the whole heaven." [Dan. 7: 27.] The event of its establishment is thus described: "I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came in the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given *him* dominion, and glory, and *a Kingdom*, that all people, nations and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and *his kingdom* that which shall not be destroyed. (Dan. 7: 13, 14.)

The parable of a Nobleman's visit to a far country was spoken to correct the notion that Christ's Kingdom, or the Kingdom of God—for the terms are synonymous, and are used interchangably—was to be of this world. This similitude was drawn from a custom which arose in the Roman Empire. When one aspired to the throne of a province of the Empire, they proceeded to Rome to urge their claim and procure, if possible, from the Imperial Government, authority to exercise the coveted kingly power. Herod, and several of his successors, were invested with the Kingdom of Judea as the result of such expeditions. If successful in their mission, they returned to take possession, with power to reward their friends, punish their enemies, or all who should rebel against their authority.

In the parable the Savior carries out the similitude quite fully. He says: "A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom AND TO RETURN....But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, "We will not have this man to reign over us."....And it came to pass when *he was returned*, having received [been invested with] *the kingdom*," he proceeded at once to reckon with his servants; the faithful being rewarded, and his enemies, who would not that he should reign over them, slain in his presence." (Luke 19: 11–27.)

This Nobleman is the Divine Son of God. He took the journey to a far country when he ascended from Christ to his Father's throne. As he went up, angels stood by to testify that he had not left this world forever, but that the nobleman should return—"This same Jesus shall so come in like manner as you have seen him go into heaven." (Acts 1: 11.) And in harmony with the parable, which makes the time of *the return* of

UMI

the Nobleman, "having received the kingdom, the time of the recompense of his faithful, and the punishment of the unfaithful servants, and his enemies, Paul says Christ shall judge all men, "the quick and the dead, *at his appearing and kingdom.*" (2 Tim. 4: 1.) He makes the judgment, the personal coming (*Epipheneian*), and the setting up of Christ's Kingdom synchronal events; which harmonizes again with the Savior's own collocation of those scenes: "When the Son of man *shall come* in his glory....THEN shall he *sit upon the throne* of his glory ....and before him shall be gathered all nations....and THEN shall he say unto them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, INHERIT THE KINGDOM prepared for you from the foundation of the world." (Mat. 25: 31–34.)

Another parable, or rather its inspired exegesis, is equally explicit: "So shall it be in the end of *this world* [*aionion*—age dispensation]: the Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of HIS KINGDOM [*i. e.* its territory, "the field," which is the world, v. 38], all things that offend, and them that do iniquity. THEN shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." (Matt. 13: 40–43.)

In strict accordance with all the foregoing testimony, the Revelator heard it announced from heaven in connection with the reward of the saints, small and great, and the destruction of the corrupters of the earth, that "the kingdoms of this world, are become the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever." (Rev. 11: 15–18.)

We may perhaps here best consider an apparent contradiction of this plain teaching that the kingdom of Christ is yet future, and to be ushered in by the sounding of the seventh trumpet and the scenes of the judgment. In ch. 1: 9, we read: "I, John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and, *in the Kingdom* and patience of Jesus Christ." The contradiction is the result of a claim which some have set up that John was even, while on Patmos, *in the kingdom*, which they affirm, is the gospel church. But all must admit that the contradictionis *only apparent* and not real. This being the case, we inquire, which shall be the standard of interpretation, the many passages, or the one? And there can be but a single answer. The numerous citations we have offered (and many more are given in other connections) which clearly locate the kingdom of Jesus at his second advent in glory, cannot yield their sense to

this one text; *it* must for consistency's sake, harmonize with them.

Nor is the solution of this apparent difficulty the occasion of perplexity. Wakefield renders the passage—"I John, your brother, and sharer with you in enduring the affliction of the kingdom of Jesus." Bloomfield remarks, that by tribulation and patience "are denoted afflictions and troubles to be endured for the sake and in the cause of Christ: and *basil* [kingdom] intimates that he is to be partaker with them in the kingdom prepared for them." And from the analogy of scripture we conclude that these expositors are right: "We must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God." (Acts 14: 22.) "If we suffer, we shall also reign with him." (2 Tim. 2: 12.) "If so be that we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified together." (Rom. 8: 17.) And we may also remark that the Syriac (Murdochs vers.) reads: "I John, your brother, and partaker with you, in the affliction and suffering that are in Jesus the Messiah."

But we remark further, that the location of Christ's throne is unquestionably assigned to the new earth by his statement in Matt. 19: 28: "Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, *when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory*, ye also shall sit on twelve thrones, judging [or condemning] the twelve tribes of Israel." An unfortunate but now almost universally repudiated punctuation, which has obtained in many American editions of the Bible, has given rise to the idea that 'the regeneration' here spoken of refers to the age of the introduction of the gospel. A greater blunder could scarcely be conceived. We believe the punctuation adopted above is generally conceded to be correct. And the error in exegesis should be discarded with the inaccuracy in grammar.

This regeneration (*palingenesia*) coincides with the restitution (*apocatastasis*) of Acts 3: 21; and, also, with the new earth of Rev. 21 and 22. Of the first we read that *then* the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory. Of the second, that the heavens must retain Jesus Christ *until* that period, when God shall send him again to earth. Of the third, that the throne of "the Lamb" is in it. The force of this synchronism is evident and requires no comment.

In harmony with the above, the Syriac version of the New

UMI

Testament reads—"When the Son of man shall sit on *the throne of his glory in the new world.*" And to this reading agree the Persic, Italian, French, and Spanish translations. Dr. Robinson, thus defines *palingenesia*: "Renovation, restoration, restitution, from decay or ruin, to a former state. Equivalent to *apocatastasis.* In the New Testament spoken of the complete external manifestation of the Messiah's kingdom, when *all things* are to be delivered from their present corruption, and restored to spiritual purity and splendor." To this agree Alford, Wordsworth, Geo. Campbell, Lange, Stier, J. Wesley, Clarke, French, Barnes, Hall and other eminent critics.

Nor can we, in view of the weight of testimony upon this point, do less than adopt the language of Bengel, when he concludes from this text, that there will be *a new creation*, over which *the second Adam will preside*, when the whole microcosm of human nature, by means of the resurrection, and also the macrocosm of the universe, *will be born again.*" And Dr. Wordsworth is clearly right in referring the *palingenesia* to "the new birth of the saints, in the New Jerusalem," citing 2 Pet. 3: 13; Rev. 3: 12, 21; 21: 5, as proof texts: "for the throne of God, and of the Lamb shall be in it, and his servants shall serve him and see his face."

This, then, is the glorious reality adumbrated by David's kingdom. As we found Canaan given to Abraham's natural seed, to be a figure of the saint's inheritance; as we discovered in Jerusalem, its metropolis, a prefiguration of that resplendant city which is to come down from God out of heaven; so we have learned that David's temporal kingdom, bequeathed to his children on conditions of obedience, was a type of the kingdom that "cannot be moved," that "shall not be destroyed," nor "given to other people," but shall "have no end." And as the Abrahamic inheritance becomes the rightful possession of Abraham's illustrious seed, so the throne, enduring as the days of heaven itself, is rightfully claimed by the Root and Offspring of the house of Jesse, whom David himself called Lord, though he was his own son.

These are "the sure mercies of David." Our promised Leader and Commander will soon be with us, to lead us to living fountains of water, and wipe all tears from our eyes. "He which testifieth these things saith, surely I come quickly! Amen. Even so come Lord Jesus."

STUART ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT: A REVIEW.[1]

By Henry Constable, Prebendary of Cork, Ireland.

As a Commentator on Scripture we have long known the writings of Moses Stuart. When preparing for the office of the ministry some of them formed a portion of our Theological Course. In the University of Dublin, our Alma Mater, the name of the late Professor of Andover has been a well-known and honored name. But it is only very recently that our attention has been drawn to that work of his on *Future Punishment* which we now propose briefly to review. The learned Professor has gone to his rest in Christ, and the above work is now republished by the Presbyterian Publication Committee of Philadelphia as a book imperatively demanded by the religious controversies of the present day. (Introduction). It is republished, as we understand, with a special view to the refutation of what is pertinaciously called the theory of annihilation, but which God's word speaks of as the doctrine of eternal death and everlasting destruction.

With all respect for the gentlemen who have republished this old book we do not think that they are wise. It is our firm persuasion that if Moses Stuart were now alive he would not have put forth this work as suitable for the present day. He wrote it at a period which has long gone by, not so much by any length of time as by a great and fast-growing change of opinion. What he *assumes* as indisputable is now the great question in debate, viz.: *the inalienable immortality of man.*

Those with whom he argued, and against whom he wrote—the advocates of Universal Restoration—were then, as they now are, agreed with him on this fundamental point. Were it to be allowed that this dogma of immortality were true there is indeed great force in the Professor's argument. As against *us*, who deny this doctrine of man's inalienable immortality, his reasoning has no force whatever. Powerful against Origen's theory, it is powerless against ours. With the greater part of

[1] Exegetical Essays on Several Words relating to Future Punishment: By the late Moses Stuart. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee.

his book we cordially agree. We think he has clearly and ably established the true sense of the words relative to future punishment in Scripture. His arguments here are our arguments, and his conclusion ours. With Moses Stuart we hold the eternity of future punishment, and deny that there is any probation after the judgment, or any restoration from hell. But here precisely where he has vanquished Origen he meets with a new foe who agrees with him up to this point. He now comes face to face with us who hold as much as he the eternity of future punishment; but, *what is the nature of this eternal punishment?* Is it the eternal deprivation of life, or is it an eternal existence in living agony? *That depends on the dogma of man's inalienable immortality, and that dogma Moses Stuart has assumed as an undisputed and indisputable truth!*

The subject proposed for inquiry by Prof. Stuart shows us clearly the impression, almost an undisturbed one, under which he wrote. It is "Whether men shall be *happy or miserable* in a future world *through endless ages.*" (Preface.) He assumes the existence of all men through these endless ages, and supposes that the only serious inquiry is, whether they shall be, during them, "happy or miserable." Now the readers of Scripture know, or may easily know, that this is *not* the proposition of Scripture. The blessing which it proposes to faith is "*Life*:" the curse which it holds up to unbelief is "*Death*" (Deut. 30: 15–19; Jer. 21: 8:) the reward which it proposes to "patient continuance in well doing" is "*Immortality*:" the penalty which it lays before the mind of the disobedient is "*everlasting destruction.*" (Rom. 2: 7; 6: 23; 2 Thess. 1: 9.) So far from supposing sinful man to be possessed of an endless existence it supposes him to be in the land of the shadow of death. If he looks for immortality he must come to Christ, the life-giver, for it. Had Stuart proposed for his inquiry whether the wicked should live or die during those endless ages of the future, he would put the proposition of Scripture.

In p. 11 we see the idea which suggested his proposition, and which made it appear to his mind the only one worthy of serious consideration. *It was his idea of human nature.* He speaks of man as "a being endowed with a spirit which can never cease to exist," and possessed with feelings which "must be immortal as the spirit from which they spring." Now with his immediate opponents this was fair and natural enough. It was with

Universalists that his argument lay. They assume the inalienable immortality of man just as much as their opponents of the school of Augustine. It is for them as for these a necessity. These two schools of theology may appear to be completely opposed one to the other, but it is only in their *conclusions.* In the *premises* of their propositions they are perfectly agreed. Both hold the inalienable immortality of man, and both maintain that the terms descriptive of the sinner's future punishment must be therefore interpreted in some secondary and figurative sense. What this sense should be they differ on. One holds the future death of the sinner to be his death *in sin*, and the other holds it to be his death *to sin;* and so the Augustinian consigns his immortal creation to endless misery and pollution, while the Universalist holds out before him the certainty of his ultimate restoration. But, both assume a dogma which has no foundation in truth. Where in Scripture do we find sinful man, or any part of him, described as what "can never cease to exist," and "must be immortal?" There are no doubt thousands, and tens of thousands, who think these descriptions are Scriptural, but it is only because they have heard them repeated as truths from childhood to age by men whom they look up to as teaching them out of God's word. Great in God's sight is the responsibility of the man who dares to utter from the pulpit or teach through the press the doctrine that sinful man is immortal. For he is teaching what God's word has expressly denied. He is guilty not merely of teaching what is not in Scripture, but of contradicting its express statements. Our Stuarts, and Landises, and Mattisons, and Beechers, and Bartletts, are just doing what Christ condemned the Pharisees of his day for doing—"teaching for doctrine the commandments of men." We do not say they do it *consciously*, but *unconsciously* they certainly do. The immortality they teach for all men is God's gift to redeemed man through Jesus Christ.

In some dozen lines Prof. Stuart gives his reasons for supposing all men to be possessed of an inalienable immortality. He evidently considers even these dozen lines to be superfluous and a waste of argument. He tells us that God "Who made us in his own image, made us immortal like himself; immortal in regard to the powers and faculties, as well as the existence of the soul; the immortal subjects, therefore, of happiness or misery in the future state." (p. 12.) Here is positively all the *argument*

which a learned professor thirty-seven years ago thought it needful to advance for a dogma from which, according to his reasoning, the most terrible conclusions must flow—the eternal wailing of myriads of God's creatures—the eternal existence of the evil which God abhors!

Now we do not question the general statement of the first clause of Stuart's statement as above. We hold that God made man in his own image, and that consequently man as first made by God was immortal, *i. e.* not subject to death. It is the *inference* which Stuart and his school draw from this which we utterly deny. That inference is that as man was originally made immortal so he must ever afterwards, no matter under what change of circumstances, continue to be immortal. Let us examine this argument. We are almost ashamed to do so. It is so puerile, so childish, that we are reluctant to have to meet it. But as it is the constant and much-vaunted argument of our opponents we are compelled to do so.

Stuart tells us that God made *man* in his own image, and consequently possessed of an inalienable immortality. Now what is *man*, who was made in the image of God? He is a being composed of body animated by spirit. (Gen. 2: 7.) It was *this being* upon whom immortality was bestowed. It was not on a portion of this being, but on this being as a whole, that God's image was impressed. Consequently if Stuart's argument were worth anything, this being, man, *as a whole*, could not lose his immortality. Body and spirit, united together in an eternal union, must continue to possess an unending existence. For what Scripture speaks of as made in God's image is *man*, the being composed of body and spirit united. Were Stuart's argument a good one, we could never see this union destroyed, or any part of this immortal creature reduced to a state of unconscious death. The death which comes to all men, which reduces at least the body to lifelessness, which destroys the living union of body and spirit, overthrows by visible fact the inference of Stuart.

But his inference is shown to be baseless in other ways. To be worth anything at all, the inference must be *universal*, not particular. If it be true as a reasonable argument that man could not lose God's image of immortality, it must be equally true in reason that he could not lose God's image in any other respect. Now immortality was not man's only resemblance to God. He resembled his Maker in holiness also. This part of God's image Stuart and his school allow that man lost. They cannot therefore deny that he might also lose the image of immortality. The inference that immortality once possessed could never become lost or alienated is shown to be baseless by the fact that holiness once possessed was alienated and lost by man. We cannot at will distinguish between the qualities bestowed originally by God on man and say some of them might be lost, but others might not be lost. If God were pleased so to distinguish, of course we should accept his distinction. For man, by his own reason, so to distinguish, is to assume an infallibility which does not belong to him. So far as we can judge, reason leads us to the very opposite conclusion to that of Stuart. If immortal existence were, as surely it was, bestowed upon man *for the use which he was to make of it*, viz.: to be happy himself in and through his glorifying his Maker, the inference of reason seems to be that when the use and object of existence were gone, the existence itself should also be withdrawn. We know this to be the true inference of reason from the words of Scripture, which tell us that man's sin was followed by man's death.

We will now merely add that Stuart himself unwittingly confesses that his own inference is worth nothing. If from the fact that man was made in God's image of immortality it follows as an immediate and necessary consequence that he must continue forever to be immortal, it is quite plain that the Old Testament in its first chapter taught plainly and distinctly the immortality of man. If we can, as all our Augustinian reasoners insist, infer at once and without danger of error that man is immortal and must ever continue immortal because he was made in the image of the immortal God, it is equally certain that the Old Testament from the very first taught the doctrine of man's inalienable immortality. It was not reserved for later times, or a Gospel Dispensation, to bring this great truth to light. Then it is, according to Stuart's school, written with a pen of iron on that indestructible record which has been preserved from Moses' time to ours—"*So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him.*" (Gen. 1: 27.)

But Prof. Stuart thinks nothing of the kind! Within two short pages his inference, plain, unmistakable, certain, has faded from memory and view! He no longer considers Gen. 1: 27 to teach with any clearness or any distinctness his theory of the im-

UMI

mortality of man. All is yet dark, shadowy, indistinct, in that old record which the fatal necessity of his false position had but just forced him to pronounce to shine in heaven's own light. At p. 13 he said—"He who made us in his own image made us immortal like himself;" at p. 15 he says—"how true it is—and what a glorious blessed truth it is—that 'life and immortality are brought to light in the gospel!' *It is equally true, that they are brought to light only there.*'"

Now we will take the liberty to follow Stuart in his later rather than in his earlier conclusion. The Courtier of Macedon appealed from Philip drunk to Philip sober. We will appeal from Stuart stupified by the fumes of a philosophical heresy to Stuart drinking in the invigorating but not intoxicating draught of the *pure word* of God.

Prof. Stuart's admissions on this question of immortality are indeed worthy of serious consideration by the parties who are now bringing up the old man from his grave to speak what we are quite satisfied he would not speak were he now alive. To them we commend them. They are two in number, each most important in our present controversy.

And, in the first place, that *natural argument* for the immortality of the soul which is so generally relied on, Stuart abandons as *worthless!* "*The light of nature*," he truly says, "can never scatter the darkness in question. This light has never yet sufficed to make even the question clear to any portion of our benighted race, *Whether the soul of man is immortal?* Cicero, incomparably the most able defender of the soul's immortality of whom the heathen world can yet boast, very ingenuously confesses that, after all the arguments which he had adduced in order to confirm the doctrine in question, it so fell out, that his mind was satisfied of it, only when directly employed in contemplating the arguments adduced in its favor. At all other times, he fell unconsciously into a state of doubt and darkness." (p. 14.) We hope our Presbyterian brethren of America, who have republished this candid admission of the man who in his lifetime was the praise of their communion for scholarly ability, will remember these words when they discuss the question of the immortality of the soul.

The second admission of Stuart is that which we have adverted to above, viz.: that not even in the writings of the Old Testament was his theory of immortality brought to light. (p.

15.) **Serious admissions either! Very serious admissions combined! Neither human reason nor the Old Testament, according to Stuart, taught clearly the Augustinian theory of the immortality of the soul! To the New Testament alone does our Professor refer the promulgation of this fundamental part of his theory! And where does it teach it, if it had not been already taught in the older Scriptures? Is it in its *illustrations* which speak of the wicked as to be burnt up like chaff, and consumed like tares? Why, these are the illustrations of the Old Testament which speak of the wicked as destined to consume like smoke, and to burn like tow! Is it from Matt. 10:28, which tells us that God will destroy both body and soul in hell? Is it in its numerous passages which speak of death as the end of sinners? Why, death is the end which the Old Testament predicts for them in passages almost beyond number! Is it by its threat of an "unquenchable fire?" The Old Testament too has its "everlasting burnings," and its smoke that ascends forever! Truly, if the Old Testament has not plainly taught the Augustinian dogma of the immortality of sinners, the New Testament has thrown no additional light upon this Egyptian doctrine. Nor was it intended to do so. It cannot be said to have taught the end of the wicked with much more, if any more, distinctness and clearness than the Old Testament had already done. The doom of sin—blackness, darkness, destruction, death—was already clearly known even from that day when God declared that the sinful soul must die. It was a *blessed immortality* that the gospel of Jesus Christ shed its light upon. It was the immortality of the redeemed, and their endless life, that the Savior came to assure us of, to tell us how this should be attached, even through him; to show us what we should thus obtain by the sight of the open tomb of Gethsemane from which he who was dead rose up to a life which was to know no end.**

Here is where the Augustinian theorists are in sad and mournful error. Here is where they represent the gospel of Christ in a light that renders it odious. The immortality which he came to assure men of was not an immortality, in any case, of wo. His immortality was a precious gift, a priceless boon, wherever and by whomsoever it was obtained. It was a gift to the lost and to the dead such as he had once bestowed upon the clod of earth when in the primal time he fashioned man; only now not ever to know the loss of life again.

UMI

We have already remarked that Prof. Stuart in the book we are reviewing *is not reasoning with us.* This appears from the fact that with the larger part of his book we most cordially agree. Thus a great portion of it (pp. 27–102) is taken up with the discussion of the proper sense of the Greek words *aion, aionios,* translated in our version by "forever" "everlasting" "eternal," etc. We can only say that with all his learned argument here we entirely agree. With his conclusion drawn from it we also fully concur. That conclusion is, that "it does most plainly and indubitably follow, that if the Scriptures have not asserted the endless punishment of the wicked, neither have they asserted the endless happiness of the righteous, nor the endless glory and existence of the Godhead. The one is equally certain with the other. Both are laid in the same balance. They must be tried by the same tests. And if we give up the one, we must, in order to be consistent, give up the other also." (p. 83.)

The truth is that the eternity of future punishment is one of our main bases just as much as it is of the theory of Augustine. Truth opposes *all error.* On the question of future punishment two grand errors contend for acceptance. One, that of Origen, contends for the *temporary* nature of future punishment. Against this, Scripture presents its aspect of the *eternity* of that punishment. So far as this aspect is concerned the Augustinian reasons with force and truth; but this aspect is just as much our truth as his. He overthrows with this truth *the Universalist's hope,* but he has not with it shaken one stone in our edifice. Cordially, freely, unreservedly, do we go with him in every step of his reasoning here. In his success we rejoice, for it is *our* success as well. But when he arrives at this point, and thinks his whole end is gained, we remind him that he must now take us up. We allow the punishment of sinners to be everlasting, but we contend that it is of a kind different from that which he maintains.

And here comes the new question which the Augustinian theorists in general pass over with closed eyes, but which we will not allow them thus to pass by any more. It is, *What is the nature of the future punishment?* Of course their punishment is an everlasting punishment, but so we contend is ours also, with the additional advantage of being the very kind of punishment which Scripture speaks of.

Here we ask our opponents to meet us. Here they have not

fairly, or scarcely at all, met us as yet. It is not enough for them to establish the eternity of punishment. We go fully with them so far as that. But let them inquire into the true nature of punishment, and into its various kinds. This they shun to do. In the second chapter of a work of ours[1] on this subject we have presented our reasons for supposing that a destruction which has effected an eternal loss of existence, and which has been inflicted for punishment, is an everlasting punishment. We would draw the attention of the "Presbyterian Publication Committee" of Philadelphia and New York to our little work. We have challenged our opponents in England to take up our argument and refute it. As yet they have been silent. We now challenge our opponents in America to do the same. We have not shunned to meet in fair argument the ablest writers that America has produced on this question. Will Prof. Bartlett take us up as we have taken up him? If not, will the Author of *The Conflict of Ages* see whether in our theory there is not a truer issue found than Pythagoras of old dreamed of? We would here gladly meet Prof. Stuart, but he has passed away. A scholar, a man of candor, and a divine, we would have gladly discussed with him the greatest religious question of our day. But that may not be. Where he is, he knows not of the new aspects which it has assumed. Let some one on whom his cloak has fallen come forward to maintain the thesis where he left it off. We will give him the proposition for discussion, not in our own words but in the words of one of the great European divines of the seventeenth century, one to whom the Puritan founders of the New England States would look up with the profoundest reverence. "May it not," says Herman Witsius, Theological Professor of Utrecht and Leyden, "may it not, in its measure, be reckoned an infinite punishment, should God please to doom man, who was by nature a candidate for immortality, to total annihilation, from whence he should never be suffered to return to life?" (Covenants 1. v. 42.) Will some Professor of Andover or Chicago condescend to inform us why it may not?

[1] *Duration and Nature of Future Punishment.* London: Longmans &, Co. price 75c. A valuable work.—Ed. *Quarterly.*

THE POPULAR SUPERSTITION: GHOSTS.

By ELD. O. R. FASSETT, Minneapolis, Minn.

What is a ghost?

It is generally conceived that there is within man a ghost-man which makes its exit out of the body at death, and which has a conscious existence somewhere in the universe, usually supposed to be either in *heaven* or *hell*. This ghost-man is said to be, by ghost theorists, "essentially the form of the human body." Also, "that it is furnished with all the organs and functions requisite for animal life." It has a ghost-body, the semblance of the physical organism;—a ghost-head, ghost-hands, ghost-feet, and is furnished with ghost-wings in addition to what the physical body now possesses. It has upon its ghost-head a ghost-crown (if it be a good ghost), in its ghost-hands a ghost-harp, and flies through etherial regions with its ghost-wings:

——"Etherial things, on unseen wings,
Through endless space, wandering."

It has ghost-eyes, ghost-ears, ghost-nose, and a ghost-mouth, with which to see, hear, smell and taste, of the good things of "the spirit world;" and a ghost-tongue with which to sing the heavenly melodies of "the spirit land." And the Christian world gives countenance to this fancied immaterialistic existence, in her prosaic works and poetic effusions. Christian religionists everywhere sing the senseless words:

"Then in a nobler sweeter song,
I'll sing thy power to save;
When this poor lisping stammering tongue
Lies silent in the grave."

A distinguished Presiding Elder in one of the Northwestern States, in endeavoring to maintain the immaterialistic doctrine against the materialistic, said: "In death I do not expect to die. Death is like passing through a door into another apartment. I die; but I am——[calling himself by name] still;" intimating both by words and gesture that his ghost-self was like to the conformation and structure of his physical-man, and as large as

his present life-size! yet in the same discourse he remarked that "the spirit-man had no need to go around the world to visit China, but it could pass directly through the globe itself." Marvelous existence this—the immaterialistic state! What strides in "philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of this world, and not after Christ." (Col. 2: 8.)

Immaterialistic ghosts are popularly believed to be of life-size, wearing garments of the same measure in which their physical bodies were once clothed, and yet so etherialized as to be able to pass through material objects of the greatest solidity with the utmost ease! Alas, for human credulity.

Two lads were passing through a grave yard together. One said to the other—"All these dead people have gone to heaven." The other replied, having been better informed—"It is strange then that nobody ever saw them go!" And is it not so, if the above theory be true, that ghosts are of the size and semblance of the physical organism.

Two younger children, a little boy and girl, had this dialogue on the occasion of the death of the little girl's infant brother, and on the return from the burial: Hattie was weeping over the loss of her little brother when her little playmate in the other part of the dwelling endeavored to comfort her with the popular faith and hope. "Hattie, don't cry. Your brother has gone to heaven," said the little boy. "No!" answered Hattie, "My brother has gone to the cemetery. I seed 'em take him there." "Why, no," said the little boy, "your brother has gone to heaven; my mother says so; and he's got little wings on his back; and he's a little angel there, flying all about." Hattie was confounded at this new theology she had never before heard, and so against her own judgment founded on the fact of her seeing her little brother buried in the ground; but after a little replied to this with emphasis—"My brother has gone to the cemetery, I tell you; and I seed 'em put him in his little grave. And *my* mother says, when Jesus comes he will bring him out of his grave, and I shall see him again." At this the little fellow became excited to sustain the tradition taught him by his mother, and said—"Hattie, your brother has gone to heaven; my mother says so; and he's got little wings on his back; and if you don't be still you shan't go to heaven when you die, and have little wings on your back!"

This was the end of the controversy. Hattie made no reply,

THE POPULAR SUPERSTITION: GHOSTS.

By ELD. O. R. FASSETT, Minneapolis, Minn.

What is a ghost?

It is generally conceived that there is within man a ghost-man which makes its exit out of the body at death, and which has a conscious existence somewhere in the universe, usually supposed to be either in *heaven* or *hell*. This ghost-man is said to be, by ghost theorists, "essentially the form of the human body." Also, "that it is furnished with all the organs and functions requisite for animal life." It has a ghost-body, the semblance of the physical organism;—a ghost-head, ghost-hands, ghost-feet, and is furnished with ghost-wings in addition to what the physical body now possesses. It has upon its ghost-head a ghost-crown (if it be a good ghost), in its ghost-hands a ghost-harp, and flies through etherial regions with its ghost-wings:

——"Etherial things, on unseen wings,
Through endless space, wandering."

It has ghost-eyes, ghost-ears, ghost-nose, and a ghost-mouth, with which to see, hear, smell and taste, of the good things of "the spirit world;" and a ghost-tongue with which to sing the heavenly melodies of "the spirit land." And the Christian world gives countenance to this fancied immaterialistic existence, in her prosaic works and poetic effusions. Christian religionists everywhere sing the senseless words:

"Then in a nobler sweeter song,
I'll sing thy power to save;
When this poor lisping stammering tongue
Lies silent in the grave."

A distinguished Presiding Elder in one of the Northwestern States, in endeavoring to maintain the immaterialistic doctrine against the materialistic, said: "In death I do not expect to die. Death is like passing through a door into another apartment. I die; but I am——[calling himself by name] still;" intimating both by words and gesture that his ghost-self was like to the conformation and structure of his physical-man, and as large as

his present life-size! yet in the same discourse he remarked that "the spirit-man had no need to go around the world to visit China, but it could pass directly through the globe itself." Marvelous existence this—the immaterialistic state! What strides in "philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of this world, and not after Christ." (Col. 2: 8.)

Immaterialistic ghosts are popularly believed to be of life-size, wearing garments of the same measure in which their physical bodies were once clothed, and yet so etherialized as to be able to pass through material objects of the greatest solidity with the utmost ease! Alas, for human credulity.

Two lads were passing through a grave yard together. One said to the other—"All these dead people have gone to heaven." The other replied, having been better informed—"It is strange then that nobody ever saw them go!" And is it not so, if the above theory be true, that ghosts are of the size and semblance of the physical organism.

Two younger children, a little boy and girl, had this dialogue on the occasion of the death of the little girl's infant brother, and on the return from the burial: Hattie was weeping over the loss of her little brother when her little playmate in the other part of the dwelling endeavored to comfort her with the popular faith and hope. "Hattie, don't cry. Your brother has gone to heaven," said the little boy. "No!" answered Hattie, "My brother has gone to the cemetery. I seed 'em take him there." "Why, no," said the little boy, "your brother has gone to heaven; my mother says so; and he's got little wings on his back; and he's a little angel there, flying all about." Hattie was confounded at this new theology she had never before heard, and so against her own judgment founded on the fact of her seeing her little brother buried in the ground; but after a little replied to this with emphasis—"My brother has gone to the cemetery, I tell you; and I seed 'em put him in his little grave. And *my* mother says, when Jesus comes he will bring him out of his grave, and I shall see him again." At this the little fellow became excited to sustain the tradition taught him by his mother, and said—"Hattie, your brother has gone to heaven; my mother says so; and he's got little wings on his back; and if you don't be still you shan't go to heaven when you die, and have little wings on your back!"

This was the end of the controversy. Hattie made no reply,

but in her grief and confusion went to inquire of her mother more perfectly concerning the hope with which to comfort her little broken and bereaved heart.

This conversation was overheard by the mother of the little boy, and she informed Hattie's mother, by whom the fact was reported to the writer, who officiated at the funeral, and endeavored to comfort the sorrowing family with the hope the gospel affords.

Some suppose that the ghosts of the departed dead are all around us, and like the frogs in Egypt are into everything. They are in our parlors, dining-rooms, bed-rooms, kitchens, closets, and cellars; in the furniture, the instruments of music; on the table, in it, and under it; among the chairs, dishes, and crockery; and it is conceived, too, that "every man attends his own funeral."

In conversation with an intelligent orthodox divine, he maintained that the spirits of the dead were all about in the room in which we were then sitting. I endeavored to show him the inconsistency of such belief with another entertained by him, that they went to heaven or to hell when the body died. Preachers on funeral occasions will advocate the doctrine of immediate rewards in heaven or hell of departed human spirits, and yet in the same sermons speak of the dead as being there present in the midst, or near the mourning circle! I remarked to the clergyman mentioned above, that he was advocating the doctrine of modern Spiritism. And what will prevent the ministry and the membership of our churches from embracing modern Spiritism, with these conceptions of the state of the dead? In fact "the orthodoxy" of the present day, concerning the intermediate and future state of the dead, is "giving aid and comfort" to Spiritists; and there is too much truth in the saying that "Spiritism is orthodoxy gone to seed."

It is affirmed by certain ones that "the human family are like the trees of the forest, when the old trees are cut down new trees spring up in their places." If it was meant by this to teach the Scriptural fact—"One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh" (Eccl. 1: 4); or the passing away by mortality of old,—and the coming of new generations of men to fill their places, it would not be an objectionable figure. But when it is meant that on the death of individuals and generations of mankind, "new ghost-men come from, and hover over

the bodies of the dead," constituting a new generation of the old in a new form of life; and that "death is but the evolution of life," we object. The illustration is not a well chosen one to illustrate such change: for usually the new forest is a new class of trees from new seeds or germs; and if it were not so, it is yet to be proved that from the defunct bodies and the sepulchers of the dead there arise new "ghost-men" to fill the places of the dead, or any other part of the universe of God.

A Christian woman, and the wife of a clergyman, I am informed, visits the cemetery and grave of her departed daughter very frequently, and very sincerely imagines that the ghost of her daughter is to this day near that grave, which she keeps in the utmost taste and order. Could it be supposed that with the blessed Bible in our hands which brings "life and immortality to light," and gives us "the blessed hope" of "the resurrection from the dead," Christians should be led astray by this heathen superstition? But so it is: and the error is wide spread through "evangelical" churches.

The Bible doctrine concerning the dead is clearly stated: "Thou changest his countenance, and sendest him away. His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them." (Job 14: 20, 21.) "There is one event unto all:.... They live, and after that they go to the dead. The dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward." "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." (Eccl. 9: 3, 5, 10.) "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." (Ps. 115: 17.) "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." (Ps. 146: 4.) "The grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I do this day." (Is. 38: 18, 19.)

It is no honor to the most High to say of all like passages and these, that God reveals to men that *dead carcasses* "know not anything;" and "praise not the Lord." The word of God is concerning "*the dead*"—not carcasses! When the dead shall again have "knowledge," and "praise the Lord," is when "the Lord of hosts will swallow up death in victory." Then the "dead" will "awake and sing." (Is. 25: 8; 26: 19.) And the

UMI

epoch of the fulfillment of this Scripture is " at the last trump." (1 Cor. 15: 51–57.)

Respecting the popular superstition, the subject of this paper, Dr. Good writes:

"It taught that the disembodied spirit becomes a ghost as soon as it is separated from the corporeal frame; a thin, misty, aerial form somewhat larger than life, with feeble voice, shadowy limbs, knowledge, somewhat superior to what was possessed while in the flesh; capable under particular circumstances of rendering itself visible; and retaining so much of its former features as to be recognized upon its apparition; in a few instances wandering about for a certain period of time after death, but for the most part conveyed to a common receptacle situated in the interior of the earth, and denominated *sheol*, *hades*, hell, or the world of shades. Such was the belief of the multitude in almost all countries from a very early period of time. The same popular belief was common to the Greeks and Romans. Thus Æneas, according to Virgil, in his descent into the infernal regions beholds the shades of the Trojan heroes still panting for fame and amusing themselves with the martial exercises to which they had been accustomed, and with airy semblances of horses, arms and chariots:

> "The chief surveyed full many a shadowy car,
> Illusive arms, and coursers trained for war.
> The lances fixed in earth, their steeds around,
> Now free from harness, graze the mimic ground.
> The love of horses which they had alive,
> And care of chariots, after death survive."

This ancient tradition and heathen superstition teaches that there are ghost-horses, ghost-chariots, ghost-weapons of war, and ghost-ground. Ghost-horses harnessed and unharnessed, and when unharnessed they graze the mimic ground! That ghost-men have "the love of horses which they had alive," and the same martial and hostile spirit of war! The poet well said, "illusive." And it is a "splendid illusion," as said Seneca, when he got his eyes open to the superstition.

Is it anything surprising that young men who study the Classics all their school days in our high schools, seminaries, and universities, and students who come from our theological schools where these are constantly read, should believe in and teach us the doctrines of heathendom for Christ's doctrine?

Dr. Good proceeds to speak of this tradition in the following terms, showing his doubting state of mind relative to such a ghost state, and goes as far as he well dare and save his reputation for any degree of wisdom and orthodoxy concerning the future state:

"From what remote source universal tradition may have derived the common idea of disembodied spirits, I pretend not to ascertain; its universality, independently of the sanction afforded to it by revealed religion, is no small presumption of its being founded in fact.... I throw out the idea rather as a *speculation to be modestly pursued, than a doctrine to be precipitately accredited.*"

Thousands with far less wisdom and research do plunge "precipitately" and headlong into the superstitious fable, and become bewildered as to any true conception of a future state as set forth in the gospel. Dr. Good mistakes when he says "revealed religion affords sanction to it," for this is not true, as a more careful study of the sacred word will convince us.

This heathen tradition respecting the superstition of ghosts, was incorporated into the Christian articles of faith as the Church became Latinized, and thus became a dogma of the Roman Catholic church, as it was previously incorporated into the faith of the Hebrew church from a heathen source when that church became Hellenized, and embraced the doctrine of the soul's immortality; a doctrine not found in the sacred writing.

In the several Councils of Vienna, Florence, Lateran, and others, we find in the "Papal Decrees" issued, the following:

"All doctrine either rashly asserting the position or calling in question the fact that the rational or intellectual soul is not truly and perfectly in itself, and *essentially of the form of the human body* [is condemned]; and those pertinaciously presuming to assert it otherwise should be considered *heretics*—shunned and punished as *heretics!*"

From this it appears that there were those who professed godliness in that age who did "call in question" this superstition, and were no doubt "shunned and punished as heretics." And we may fairly presume from the spirit now manifested by many that should we have a reversion of that age in the loss of religious liberty, Christian men and Christian churches, calling themselves "Evangelical" might possibly join the Roman Pontiff and Papal church in shunning and punishing as heretics those who presume now to reject the popular superstition.

Martin Luther boldly and fearlessly meets and declares these Papal edicts unworthy of Christian consideration. He says: "I permit the Pope to make and establish articles of faith for himself and his faithful, such as: The soul is the *substantial form of the human body*, *The soul is immortal*, with all those monstrous opinions to be found in the Roman dunghill of decretals."

But we must notice the scriptures usually cited in proof of the existence of ghosts of the dead.

1. *Those descriptive of the death of the Patriarchs.*

"Then Abraham gave up the ghost, and died in a good old age, an old man, and full of years; and was gathered to his people." (Gen. 25: 8.)

"To give up the ghost" does not mean as some have maintained, "to give up the guest," as though a man had "a guest," within him that death makes him surrender up. The Hebrew word *gah-vag*, rendered "giveth up the ghost," (Job 14: 10) is defined by Gesenius as follows: "To breathe out one's life—to expire, to die. He gives Gen. 6: 17; 7: 21; Ps. 104: 29 as examples of the true use of the Word. Prof. Geo. R. Noyes, as also Boothroyd, renders the text (Job. 14: 10) "Man expireth." The American Bible Union reads, "Man expires." The word has no reference whatever to a living ghost entity that makes its exit at death out from the dead carcass, or clayey tabernacle. If so, then there are ghosts of brutes as well as of men according to the teaching of the Scriptures (Gen. 6: 17; 7: 21); and the Indian's hope, as expressed in Pope's beautiful diction is a good one.

> "Lo! the poor Indian, whose untutored mind
> Sees God in clouds, and hears him in the wind,
> * * * * * * * * *
> —— thinks admitted to that equal sky
> His faithful dog shall bear him company."

The Indian with his hunting grounds, and countless herds of buffalo and deer; the Mohammedan with his luxurious couches, his beautiful houris; and the Christian with his spirit-harp of gold, tuned to diviner melodies in a spirit land, have all the same origin, in the heathen superstition, and may be traced back to Satan's master falsehood—"Ye shall not surely die." (Gen. 3: 4.)

But it is maintained, that as Abraham "was gathered to his people;" and Jacob also "yielded up the ghost, and was gathered unto his people," (Gen. 49: 33), and their bodies were buried far from the burial place of their fathers," that their "ghosts" which they "yielded up" must be referred to as being "gathered unto their fathers," and that to "the spirit land." Let us see how this supposition will agree with other scriptures: When Jacob had brought to him the intelligence of the death of Joseph (for he supposed he had been devoured by wild beasts), he said: "I will *go down into the grave unto my son mourning.*" (Gen. 37: 35.) It is apparent from this language of lamentation of the Patriarch, that he expected to "*go down*" instead of "going up," and "into the grave" instead of "into heaven," and there to his son Joseph who was a good boy; and certainly Jacob expected to be saved in a future life. The Hebrew word translated "grave" in this passage is *sheol.* The place is the receptacle for the dead, and where they are gathered is "*down into sheol,*" and that must be the "grave:" for Jacob says again, when Benjamin was demanded by his brethren to go down into Egypt: "If mischief befall him by the way—then shall ye *bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave.*" (*sheol.*) Does not this refer to the body? Have ghosts "gray hairs" in the spirit land?

The simple meaning then of being "gathered to his people," according to the book of Genesis, is, being gathered to the grave when buried, or ones return to dust. Hence "Abraham's sons, Isaac and Ishmael, buried him"—"there was Abraham buried." (Gen. 25: 8–10.) And Jacob said in his dying charge to his sons: "I am to be gathered unto my people: *bury me* with my fathers." (Gen. 49: 28–33.) If it still be claimed that their spirits or ghosts are referred to in the sentence—"gathered to his people," as in the case of Abraham (Gen. 25: 8), then the Patriarchs' spirits were gathered into the same receptacle with their idolatrous fathers! "Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, even *Terah, the father of Abraham* and the *father of Nachor;* and they *served other Gods.*" (Josh. 24: 2; 24: 14, 15.) And in the book of Judges (ch. 2: 8–10) it is written that "Joshua, died, and they buried him. *And also* all that generation were gathered unto their fathers." By this we perceive that "burial" and being "gathered unto their fathers" are synonymous terms.

Our modern translators have rendered *hades*, the Greek word corresponding with the Hebrew *sheol*, uniformly "*underworld.*" *Sheol* and *hades* thus are made to appear an "*under*world." But is that the abode or receptacle of the spirits of the dead, and are they in conscious existence there? If so they have not "ascended into the heavens." (Acts 2: 34.) And the theory that sends good men to heaven when they *die*, to "be with Christ," must be abandoned. What right have we to change the location of the abode of the departed dead to meet our fancy? Says Alexander Campbell:

UMI

"The Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans located all the souls of the dead *under the ground.* Were it either desirable or necessary to demonstrate that the receptacle of human spirits was understood by the ancient nations, Egyptians, Jews, and Pagans, of all superstitions to be deeper than the ground, a very long induction of authorities could be introduced. We might file documentary evidence incontrovertibly clear and definite."

But he adds:

"We may *dissent* from the notion of *place* and other circumstances without impairing the weight of the evidence in favor of such a state as was indicated by the word *hades.*"

We would like to know by what authority "we may dissent," especially when "the parable of the rich man and Lazarus" (Luke 16: 19–31) is quoted to prove the intermediate state; and which presents the Pharasaic doctrine of the intermediate and future rewards.[1]

Says Dr. Good:

"For the most part [the disembodied spirits] were conveyed to a common receptacle situated in the interior of the earth, and denominated *sheol, hades,* hell, or the world of shades. Such was the belief of the multitude in all countries from a very early period of time. The same popular belief was common to the Greeks and Romans....The popular tradition believed in most countries is, that this hell, *hades* or invisible world is divided into two very distinct and opposite regions by a broad and impassable gulf; that the one is a seat of happiness, a paradise, or elysium, and the other a seat of misery, a *gehenna* a *tartarus;* and that there is a supreme magistrate, and an impartial tribunal belonging to the infernal shades, before which the ghosts must appear and by which they are sentenced to the one or the other, according to the deeds done in the body. *Egypt is generally said to be the inventress of this important and valuable* part of the *common tradition,* and undoubtedly it is to be found in the *earliest records of Egyptian history.*"

Macknight, in a note on the parable of Luke 16, makes the following honest concession, in the light of ancient and traditional history:

"Because the opinions as well as the language of the Greeks had by this time made their way into Judea, some imagine that our Lord had their *fictions* about the abodes of the departed souls in his eye, when he formed this parable. But the argument is not conclusive.[2] At the same time it must be acknowledged, that his descriptions of those things are *not drawn from the writings of the Old Testament, but have a remarkable affinity*

[1] See Josephus' *Dissertation on Hades.*

[2] We would dissent from Macknight here.

to the descriptions which the Grecian poets have given of them. They as well as our Lord represent the abodes of the blessed as lying *contiguous* to the region of the damned, and separated only by a great impassable river, or deep gulf, in such a sort that the ghosts could talk with one another from its opposite banks. In the parable, souls whose bodies were buried know each other and converse together as if they had been embodied. In like manner the *Pagans* introduced departed souls talking together, and represent them as having pains and pleasures analogous to what we feel in this life; it seems they thought the shades of the dead had exact resemblance to their bodies. The parable says the souls of wicked men[3] are tormented in flames. The Grecian mythologists tell us they lie in Pyriphlegethon, which is a river of fire, where they suffer the torments they would have suffered while alive, had their bodies been burnt."

THE SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY.

What say the Scriptures concerning this "underworld" as a place of conscious reward? "To the law and to the testimony." David says: "In death there is no remembrance of thee [O Lord], in the grave *sheol* who shall give thee thanks." (Ps. 6: 5.) "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that *go down into silence.*" (Ps. 115: 17.) By which it is plain that the Psalmist regarded the "*underworld*" as a place of no conscious exercise of memory, even of the Lord; or of active praise, but a condition of *silence* profound! The important questions with him, therefore, was, "Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead? shall *the dead arise and praise thee.* Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave, or thy faithfulness in destruction?" (Ps. 88: 10, 11.) A multitude of passages might be quoted to prove that his only hope was in the resurrection from the dead. But we turn to other testimony. "The preacher," with "upright words of truth"—"the words of the wise," exhorts us: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave (*sheol*) whither thou goest." Thus the "underworld" certainly, if the preacher has written "upright words of truth," can be no place of conscious reward. (Eccl. 9: 10; 12: 8–14.)

A passage concerning the Patriarchs is found in the New Testament which is quoted to prove the conscious existence of their spirits, to which we will refer before we dismiss this part of our subject.

[3] Not so.

UMI

The Sadducees, who disbelieved in the doctrine of the resurrection, at one time had an encounter with Christ upon the question whether the dead are to live again. Mark! Their effort was not to refute the doctrine of "the immortality of the soul," as conceived: but it was a question of the resurrection of men from their graves. (See Matt. 22: 23–32.) Christ confounded them by citing the language of God to Moses in the bush: "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Exod. 3: 6), and then affirming himself: "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." (Matt. 22: 32.) This was a conclusive argument. If God is not the God of dead men, but of the living, those fathers must live again. This is by him "who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were." (Rom. 4: 17.) Had this language been used to convince them that these Patriarchs' spirits were then living, *that would never have proved their resurrection, which was the issue at stake.* All Spiritists believe in the conscious existence of dead men's spirits, but thousands of them deny "the resurrection." The Sadducees themselves saw the force of our Lord's argument in the premises, and became confounded in the charge, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God" (v. 29), and slunk away in silence, giving place to the Pharisees to try their skill upon the wisdom of him "who spake as never man spake."

2. *The passage descriptive of Rachel's death:*

"And it came to pass as her soul was in departing [for she died]. (Gen. 35: 18.)

The "departing" of Rachel's "soul" is thought to be the exit of her ghost-self! But this fancied interpretation arises from the general superstition. The meaning is explained in the parenthesis—"for she died." It was simply the departure of her *life.* The New Testament will explain: "Whosoever will save his *life* shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his *life* for my sake shall find it. For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own *soul?* or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" (Matt. 16: 25, 26.) The word which in v. 25 is translated "life," is in v. 26 rendered "soul."

A reverend gentleman with whom the writer once held a discussion, affirmed that "the original word did not mean life, in v. 26; that it was a different word altogether." "We need scarcely observe," said he, "that an intelligent person must know that without being told." I had simply to quote from Dr. Adam Clark the following remarks to set this matter at rest: "On what authority many have translated the work *psuche* in v. 25 *life*, and in v. 26, *soul*, I know not; but am certain it means life in both places."

The *soul* of a person is the *life* of the individual; and the same is true of the animal. And the entire person is a soul: "a living soul" (Gen. 2: 7) when alive; "a dead soul," when the life has departed. Hence our Savior's words as recorded by the Evangelist Luke: "For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and lose *himself.*" (Luke 9: 25.) With the loss of "life" a man loses "himself." (v. 24.)

3. *The passage descriptive of that restoration to life of the son of the widow of Zarepheth, by Elijah.*

Elijah prays: "O Lord, my God, I pray thee, let this child's soul come into him again. And the Lord heard the voice of Elijah; and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived." [1 Ki. 17: 21, 22.]

This was merely the return of the life of the child: for the last clause explains the fact—"*and he revived*" *i. e.* re-lived. So the Shunamite's son was *resuscitated* by Elisha. (2 Ki. 4: 31–37.)

4. *David's language on the death of his child.*

"Now *he is dead*, wherefore should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me." [2 Sam. 12: 23."]

Observe: the statement is first made "he is dead." When, therefore, David says—"I shall go to him," what is it, but that he speaks of the "one event unto all: they live, and after that they *go to the dead.*" (Eccl. 9: 3, 4.) "To *death*, and to the *house* appointed for all living." (Job 30: 23.) "The grave (*sheol*) is mine *house*.... our rest *together* is in the *dust.*" (Job 17: 13–16.) David refers to the same *place* which Jacob mentioned as he lamented the death of Joseph; "I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning." (Gen. 37: 35.) He could not think of going to heaven to be with him there, for that was neither his belief or hope as expressed anywhere in his writings. Besides an inspired apostle said over a thousand years after David's death: "David is not ascended into the heavens." (Acts 2: 34.) And another: "David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, *fell on sleep* and was *laid unto his fathers*, and saw corruption." (Acts 13: 36.) And David's hope as expressed by himself corresponds with the Scriptures: "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, *when I awake with thy likeness.*" (Ps. 17: 15.)

UMI

5. *Samuel's apparition.* The record of this is given in 1. Sam. 28. The statement is made in v. 3, that "Samuel was dead—and Israel had buried him;" from which we conclude he was not *alive* anywhere in the universe. It is next declared "When Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, *nor by prophets.*" This is a clear statement. Was that true and yet it also true that God sent his prophet Samuel from the dead to communicate with him? I think not, inasmuch as the Lord would have nothing to do with Saul, and had left him to his own destruction: "The Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil Spirit from the Lord troubled him." (ch. 16: 14.) If therefore Saul had any communication with or from Samuel it was through other agencies and from another source than God's "Spirit," or God himself; and the question is whether God's dead prophets are under the control of devils and witches! Let us see. Saul consulted with the "witch at Endor." He had previously "put away," in obedience to the Lord's command, "those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards out of the land." (v. 3.) But now in his fall he sends his "servants" to "seek a woman that hath a familiar spirit," in face of the fact that "all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord." (Deut. 18: 12.)

The "witch" being found he desires of her "divination by the familiar spirit," and says "bring me him *up*, whom I shall name unto thee." (v. 8.) And the "woman said, Whom shall I bring *up* unto thee? And he said, Bring me *up Samuel.*" (v. 11.) Queries: Was Samuel's ghost in heaven, or *sheol?* Was his spirit with God where Christ is, or beneath in the ground? Or was the grave of Samuel on the opposite side of the earth from the throne of God in heaven in the diurnal revolution of the globe, so that the spirit of Samuel coming down from heaven entered his tabernacle and came through the ground; or did his *ghost* have to go through the earth from the regions of infinite space to shorten the distance between him and Saul? How is it that Samuel, the Lord's dear prophet, should come "*up*" instead of down, to make communications?

"When the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice." (v. 12.) Why did not Saul see him as well? Why was he visible to the woman and invisible to Saul? There is a mystery here unsolved only by the fact that she was a "*spirit-medium.*" "The King said—What sawest thou? And the woman said I

saw gods ascending out of the earth." (v. 13.) As a "spirit-medium" under the influence of "demons" she must of course teach "the doctrine of devils:"—"Ye shall be as gods." "And he said unto her, what form is he of? And she said. An old man *cometh up;* and he is covered with a mantle. And Saul perceived that it was Samuel." From this description he "perceived." Do "the spirits" or "the ghosts" of the departed dead, of those who have died in old age and in decrepitude resemble their bodies after they have made their exit and entered the realms of blessedness or the Paradise of God? And are their "mantles" or garments which they wear on earth, or in which their dead bodies are laid out, immortalized and taken with them?

"And Samuel said unto Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up?" (v. 15.) Can we for a moment suppose that God leaves his dead prophets and saints, who have gone to their rest in the grave, or who have departed this life, in the power of witches and wicked apostates, to be disturbed and brought back to this world to be troubled with its affairs? Not for a moment. What, then, do you make of this record? inquires one. Simply this: It is a faithful history of a clever imposition practiced upon Saul by a spiritual medium, and nothing more. Josephus says: "The orders of Saul to his servants were that they should seek for him one of those women that could speak out of their bellies, and call forth the souls of the dead, that by this means he might know if his affairs should succeed. For this sort of *belly-speaking can bring up the spirits of the dead, and tell fortunes.*" It was by the art of ventriloquism this spirit-medium carried on her conversation and practiced this deception upon Saul; and it was for this forbidden sin, that Saul, as an apostate, met his sad fate. "So Saul died for his transgression which he committed against the Lord, even against the word of the Lord, which he kept not, and also for asking counsel of one that had a familiar spirit, to inquire of it; and inquired not of the Lord; therefore he slew him, and turned the kingdom unto David the son of Jesse." (1 Chron. 10: 13, 14.) Let all apostates from God and the Christian religion beware how they consult spirit-mediums or spirits of demons!

6. ***Eliphaz' vision.***

"In thoughts from the visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth on men, fear came upon me, and trembling which made all my bones to shake.

Then a spirit passed before my face; the hair of my flesh stood up: It stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof: an image was before mine eyes, there was silence, and I heard a voice, saying:" etc. (Job 4: 13–19.)

This *ghost* seen by Eliphaz happens to be in his dreams and visions by night! The spirit communication given cannot be divine revelation; for the Lord declares the language and communications Job's comforters had made, "folly." (Job 42: 8.) Yet how often is Eliphaz' spirit revelation quoted to prove that men's bodies are "houses of clay" (v. 19.) which "the immortal soul" tenants till death, when it goes into another provided for it in the heavens. (2 Cor. 5: 1.) And the attempt is made to make Paul teach the same absurdity!

The patriarch Job had no such view or hope concerning the future of men: "*Man* lieth down and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep. (ch. 14: 12.) All that constitutes "*man*" is asleep during the night of death, and not awake roaming abroad, as credited in his day by the heathen; which superstition his friends advocated and declared to be popular: "With us are both the grey-headed and very aged men." (ch. 15: 1–10.) Instead of human spirits having a conscious existence and knowledge of the world's affairs in the state of death, and roaming here and there in the universe, Job asserts they are "*at rest*," "*asleep*" (ch. 3: 12–19); and that even parents in all their solicitude for their surviving offspring have no knowledge of the condition of their sons after they themselves die. (ch. 14: 20, 21.) And he prays himself: "Oh! that thou wouldst hide *me* in the grave (*sheol*); that thou wouldst keep me secret," etc. (ch. 14: 13.) The grave (*sheol*) he declares to be his "house" during the night of death, and that his "bed" in that "house" is "in the darkness;" and furthermore, "in the dust" amidst corruption and "the worm." (ch. 17: 13–16.) And so dark and dismal is *sheol*, and "the gates of death," as he approaches them, in his conception, that he says: "I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death; a land of darkness, as darkness itself, and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness." (ch. 10: 21, 22.) Job's description of "*sheol*" his "house" in death, is not one very inviting or attractive! The blinds are so closed as not to allow a single ray of "light" to dispel the darkness; and such is the confusion that there is not the least "order" conceivable; and as to inmates, it is divided between himself and "corruption and worms." The Pharisaic "*Bosom of Abraham*," according to Job, has not many attractions.

Out of this "house" Job did not expect to "return" or have the power to do so by virtue of a "vital spirit entity which survived in death;" but he did by the power of him who is "a quickening spirit." (1 Cor. 15: 45.) Hence to those inquiring concerning his *hope* and the reasons of it, he replies: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold and not another, though my reins be consumed within me." (ch. 19: 25–27.) Eliphaz and those entertaining the immaterialistic doctrine may declare this "vain knowledge—unprofitable talk—speeches wherewith he can do no good" (Ch. 15: 2, 3), and adhere to their *visions* of ghosts and an illusive ghost-state, scouting "materialism." Yet we prefer to side with the Patriarch, as the "root of the matter is found in him," and his is the Biblical hope.

Dr. Good says, and the reader will readily excuse so lengthy a quotation in this place from him, for it is just to the point:

"If we turn from Persia, Egypt and Hindostan to Arabia, to the fragrant groves and learned shades of Dedan and Teman, from which it is certain that Persia, and highly probable that Hindostan derived its first polite literature, we shall find the entire subject of the immortality of the soul in as blank and barren a silence as the deserts by which they are surrounded; or if touched upon, only touched upon to betray doubt, and sometimes disbelief. The *tradition*, indeed of a future state of retributive justice, seems to have reached the schools of this part of the world, and to have been generally, though not universally accredited; but the future existence it alludes to is that of a *resurrection of the body, and not of a survival of the soul, after the body's dissolution.*

"The oldest book that has descended to us from this quarter (and there is little doubt that it is the oldest, or one of the oldest works in existence), is that astonishing and transcendent composition, the book of Job; a work that aught assuredly to raise the genius of Idumea above that of Greece, and that of itself is demonstrative of the indefatigable spirit with which the deepest as well as the most polished sciences were pursued in this region, during what may be called comparatively the youth and day-spring of the world. Yet in this sublime and magnificent poem, replete with all the wisdom and learning of the age, the doctrine upon the subject before us is merely as I have just stated it, a patriarchal or traditionary belief of a future state of

UMI

retributive justice, *not by the natural immortality of the soul, but by a resurrection of the body.* The Hindoo philosophers totally and universally denied a resurrection of the body, and supported the doctrine alone upon the natural immortality of the soul; but the Arabian philosophers passed over the immortality of the soul, and rested the doctrine of a future life solely upon the *resurrection of the body.*

"The schools of Greece, derived their earliest metaphysics from the Gymnosophists of India, and hence, like the latter they contended for the immortality of the soul, and overlooked and reprobated the doctrine of the resurrection of the body."

We will refer in the next place to a few passages in the New Testament upon which ghost-theorists base their faith that the ghost-state is taught in the Scriptures, not alluded to in other articles by the writer in a previous number of the *Quarterly*, and already explained in this.

"And when the disciples saw him [Jesus] walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit; and they cried out for fear. But straightway Jesus spoke to them, saying, Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid." (Matt. 14: 26, 27.)

This is simply the record of the fact that they were affrighted with the prevailing superstition. The doctrine of ghosts or spirit-apparitions is not taught in the least. It seems that "Jesus *constrained* his disciples" to take ship to the opposite side of the sea, while he "went into a mountain to pray," they expecting him to follow them afterward by another vessel. But in the night "a contrary wind arose on the sea, and they were tempest tossed in their ship. To their astonishment Jesus came in a most unexpected manner, and by a miracle they had never before seen him perform. He came walking on the sea!" The first thought was, the popular superstition—"it is his ghost!" But he soon dispelled their fears. It was himself.

Let us look at the history of the times, and the doctrine inculcated in their day which they had been taught from their youth up. *Enfield* says:

"The seeds of the Cabalistic doctrine were first sown under the Ptolemies, when the Jews began to learn the Egyptian and Oriental theology, and to incorporate these foreign dogmas with the ancient creed.... The Pharisees arose soon after the return from the Babylonian captivity in consequence of the introduction of traditionary institutions, and allegorical interpretations. They maintained "*the soul of man is spiritual and immortal.* In *the invisible world beneath the earth*, rewards and punishments will be dispensed to the virtuous. The resurrection of the body is to be expected. *They held also to the transmigration of souls.*"

Dr. Campbell remarks, in his sixth *Dissertation:*

"On the subject of a future state, we find a considerable difference in the *popular opinion* of the Jews in *our Savior's time*, from *that which prevailed in the days of the ancient prophets.* As both Greeks and Romans had adopted the notion, that the *ghosts* of the deceased were susceptible of both enjoyment and suffering, they were led to suppose a sort of retribution in that state for their merit or demerit in the present. The Jews did not indeed adopt the Pagan follies on the subject, nor did they express themselves entirely in the same manner; but the general train of thinking in both came pretty much to coincide. *The Greek hades they found well adapted to express the Hebrew sheol.* This they came to *conceive as including different characters.*"

The traditionary idea of ghosts prevailed among the Pharisees, as is seen from their language in the Acts, as well as the notion of spirit communications from the departed dead: "If a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him." (Acts 23: 9.) Luke 24: 36–39 is explained as above, by the prevailing tradition. Their understanding and knowledge of the scriptures and of the future state were so perverted by tradition that Jesus rebuked his disciples most severely: "O foolish, and slow of heart to believe." (vv. 25–27, 44–46.)

Peter's appearance at the gate when liberated by the angel of God is quoted to prove the existence of ghosts: "Then said they [the disciples], It is his angel." (Acts 12: 15.) But this is merely the superstition of the disciples who had not even yet got rid of the prevailing prejudices! They did not know but that Peter had been killed as had been James, and that it was his ghost knocking at the gate! but that did not make it so. It was Peter in reality, the man himself, as has been the case with most ghosts ever seen!

Acts 23: 9, to which we have already alluded reveals to us the belief of the Pharisees concerning the intermediate state; by which doctrine and "tradition" they "made void the word of God," and the "hope of the resurrection." To a clergyman who had quoted this in support of the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and claimed that Paul was a Pharisee in this respect, I sent the inquiry for him to answer to his congregation the next time he appeared before them—"Did Paul believe in spirit communications from the dead; and do you?" The reply has not yet been given. Nor will it be until he fully embraces Spiritism.

And we would seriously inquire if ghosts of the dead do thus

UMI

appear on earth and to the living, how is it? Do they have a furlough from heaven and hell to give their communications, or are they still in "the mundane sphere?" The fact relative to Paul was, that he was not a Sadducee in any sense of the word; for they believed in no future life whatever. "The Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit." (Acts 23: 8.) Enfield says: "They believed there will be no resurrection of the dead, nor any rewards and punishments after this life....They denied the resurrection of the dead; yea, all future existence."

Neither was Paul a Pharisee, only so far as "the resurrection of the dead" was concerned. And it is to this faith, only, he commits himself on the occasion alluded to: "Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead, I am called in question." (Acts 23: 6.) He makes no confession that he believed with the popular sect in their tradition of the immortality of the soul and a conscious intermediate state, and spirit-communication by the "shades" of the dead, and was thus a "Hellenistic Pharisee;" he was of the "Aramaic school;" "a Pharisee of the Pharisees," who rejected Hellenism and adhered solely to the Scriptural hope concerning a future state.

"There was no lack of Hellenistic synagogues at Jerusalem, which at the seasons of the festivals would be crowded with foreign pilgrims and become the scene of animated discussions. 'Hebrew of the Hebrews.' Hebrew is used for an Aramaic Jew as opposed to a Grecian or Hellenist." "The pious Hebrew was always in the attitude of expecting the Coming One." "It may be considered certain that the family of St. Paul though Hellenistic in speech (Paul could speak Greek) were no *Hellenizers in theology.* The manner in which St. Paul speaks implies the most uncontaminated hereditary Judaism. 'Are they Hebrews? So am I.'" [1]

The appearance of Moses and Elias on the Mount of Transfiguration (Matt. 16: 28; 17: 1–9), Christ himself declares to be merely a "vision" of the coming kingdom. A "vision" is not a reality. (See 2 Pet. 1: 16–21.)

Christ appeared as if immortalized and glorified in the vision: Yet he was not. And what incongruity, that both Christ and Elijah who had neither seen or experienced death should be there in person, and Moses who was "dead" and "buried," also

[1] *Life, Times and Travels* of St. Paul. Conybeare and Howson. Introduction by Bp. Simpson.

there an actual spirit, or ghost, as large as life! If he was there in actuality, he was raised from the dead. But we regard it, as Christ affirms it to be, a "*vision.*"

We have but one remaining passage to explain:

"I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God." (Rev. 22: 9.)

If this personage was one of the prophets, as is maintained, he must be one of two, either Enoch or Elijah, who were "translated that they should not see death." But by a reference to Rev. 1: 1, we learn that he is Christ's special messenger: "He sent and signified it [the revelation] by his angel unto his servant John." It is for those maintaining him to be a glorified human being to prove this; much more that he is a *ghost* of a dead prophet! The whole language and circumstances of the book of Revelation show that this holy messenger was one of that higher order of intelligences in the universe, an angel proper. "Bless the Lord, all ye his angels, that excel in strength; that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word. Bless ye the Lord, all ye his hosts; ye ministets of his that do his pleasure." (Ps. 103: 20, 21.) Paul speaks of these as ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be *heirs* of salvation" (Heb. 1: 14)—not that they are heirs of of salvation. Christ when he comes to judgment will be accompanied with "all the holy angels," whom he shall "send with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect." (Matt. 24: 30, 31.)

The spirits of the deceased are not angels, nor do they become angels as is conceived by many. The language of the above text simply implies this: that this "angel" is a "fellow servant" with the apostle of the Lord, Christ; and a fellow servant of the prophets of the same Lord, though in a higher sphere; and a creature and not the Creator, or Lord, as John thought he, a glorified being, might be. His command is to "worship God!" And this was said just as John "fell down to worship before the feet of the angel." (v. 8.)

I would remark in conclusion, that no spirits or ghosts of the departed dead have ever, or can ever appear to the living; for the plain reason that there are none such anywhere in God's universal in conscious existence to appear.

It is supposed that ghosts haunt houses; but it is usually where there are corridors, dark recesses, deep closets, or in cel-

UMI

lars that they are said to appear. But why don't we all see ghosts? And why not see as many ghosts now as were seen in former years? In my childhood I dare not go into a dark room, and especially near a grave yard, for fear of seeing ghosts. But I have long since got rid of this superstition. I can go from my cellar to my chamber, in every room of my dwelling in the darkest night, and never expect to see either the ghosts of my deceased parents, brothers, and sisters of whom I have several in their graves,—or of my children, one of whom has been borne away to the grave from my present home! The Scriptures inform me where they are, and afford me consolation in the hope of their resurrection. Thanks be to God for the light of divine revelation in my dwelling, and in my hands, and which I have hid in my heart. I prize the word of God, and the gospel above all price; and the love of God in the gift of his Son to grant me, a sinner, pardon and the hope of everlasting life through him my Redeemer, has won my heart; and to him I consecrate my life and my being evermore.

GHOST STORIES.

There are amusing instances of the superstitious believers in ghosts having been frightened nearly out of their wits. In such a frame of mind, and with such a belief as that the dead are alive and capable of communicating with the living, or are conscious of the world's affairs, the imagination in the darkness of night may create ghosts, or fancy that a white horse, cow or other animal is the spirit of a departed fellow mortal! I was pointed to a vacant house not long since which was supposed to be haunted, and every night for a succession of evenings it was visited by a multitude of people to hear the spirit rapping upon the floor of the house. The ghost, however, finally turned out to be a roaming dog which made his kennel underneath the dwelling, crawling through a hole in the wall! And when persons would speak, or invoke the spirit of the dead to make demonstration of its existence, by the wag of his tail against the floor their superstitious curiosity was gratified! It is not many months since that the Winslow House in St. Anthony, Minn., was disturbed by the ghost of a departed physician seeking communication with his surviving widow to inform her of an impending danger, it was claimed. His ghost was seen on several occasions by a girl and certain others, it was reported. Both the cities of St. Anthony and Minneapolis were disturbed by the presence of

this deceased doctor. Hundreds of people flocked to the house to get, if possible, a glimpse of the spirit in its hidings in cellars, dark recesses, and garret. The public prints at Minneapolis and St. Paul had daily reports of the spirit's wonderous doings. But finally a gun loaded with a heavy charge to shoot the apparition if it appeared expelled the ghost from the premises, so that he has not been seen or heard from to this day! But I suppose multitudes in these cities are still believers in human spirit existence after the death of the body, and ready to be duped again when Spiritist necromancers are ready to practice deception upon them.

The following Scriptures, with others, should be consulted, where God in the most positive and fearful manner denounces under penalty of the eternal loss of existence those who have anything to do with supposed human spirits, spirit communications and consultations, and "the doctrine of devils" taught by "the devil and his angels:" Lev. 19: 31; 20: 6, 27; Deut. 18: 19–12; Is. 8: 19–20; 50: 10, 11; 2 Thess. 2: 8–12; 1 Tim. 4: 1–3; 2 Tim. 3: 6–9; Rev. 16: 13–15.

The doctrine of the Bible and of the gospel concerning the mortality of our race, and the necessity of seeking for immortality (Rom. 2: 7.), through repentance, faith, and obedience to God's commands, is essential to keep us in these "last days" of "peril" from the illusive "fables," and "strong delusions" of the "doctrines of devils."

May the Lord include our hearts to credit the record that God gave of his son. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." (1 John 5: 10–12.)

LIFE AND IMMORTALITY ONLY IN CHRIST.

To those who seek a Scriptural basis for their opinions and doctrines, the question of man's immortality, whether *natural* or *acquired*, resolves itself into a simple matter of interpretation. The terms—*life*, *eternal life*, *immortality*, if understood in their literal signification, involve the doctrine of an acquired immortality; if understood metaphorically or spiritually, they leave the question of man's eternal existence untouched, assuming that man is by nature, or by original constitution, an immortal being. Can this question of interpretation, then, be definitely settled? Are there any means of determining whether these terms should be rendered literally or figuratively? I believe so. In addition to the well-known canon of interpretation, "that the literal should always be preferred, unless it involves an impossibility or an absurdity," there are two or three passages of Scripture, to speak within bounds, that cannot possibly be taken in any other than the literal sense. They establish, beyond a doubt, that immortality, eternal life, etc., are the free gift of God's grace through Christ. Immortality cannot be *both*, cannot be both natural and acquired; and if it can be shown to be derived from Christ, through redemption, then the ungodly possess it not, but they will assuredly perish. The first passage is 2 Tim. 1:10: "But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." The word *life* in this passage constitutes an antithesis to the word *death;* the term *death* being literal, without dispute, it determines the meaning of the term life. But it will be said that, granting the terms to be literal, the statement of the apostle is that life and immortality are *brought to light*, not originated or conferred by the gospel, simply uncovered or made known. Let us test the value of this interpretation. The doctrine of man's immortality brought to light by the gospel? Is it so? Is not this assumption contrary to fact? Did not human reason first discover or *invent* this doctrine? Did not Plato teach this doctrine years before the introduction of the gospel? Yea, has the gospel discovered this doctrine of man's natural immortality up to the present moment?

Can one solitary passage be produced from Scripture to prove this doctrine of man's natural immortality? No! This rendering of the passage will not stand. But further, the theory of our opponents requires that the word *life* should be understood figuratively; let us test this application of the passage by the same rule. *Life*, then—spiritual life—is not originated or conferred by the gospel, but simply "brought to light." Will this rendering coincide with the teaching of Scripture? Certainly not. If salvation be not by and through the gospel, then all the teaching of the apostle Paul is wrong.

The conclusion of the matter, then, is this—the terms life and immortality are literal, and the phrase, brought to light, must be understood to mean—*to make known.* The scope of the passage is this:—the gospel makes known how life and immortality may be obtained: "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."

Second passage—John 6:57: "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me shall live by me." The terms live and living in this quotation must be understood in the same sense; either all are literal or all are figurative. The text constitutes a syllogism, and consequently the terms in the premise and the conclusion must be the same, or the argument falls to the ground. Can any other meaning than the literal be given to the words the "*living Father*" and "I *live* by the Father," so he that eateth me (or believeth in me) shall *live* by me? Can any language be plainer that life, eternal life, is only to be found in Christ?

Third passage—Rom. 8:13: "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." The *die* and *live* in this text must be rendered literally. Try it *figuratively* or *spiritually:* "If ye walk after the flesh ye shall die." *Shall* die? Should it not be, "Ye are already dead?" "If ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body ye *shall* live, should it not be, "Ye *are* alive, ye *possess* spiritual life?"

The use of the future tense implies that the death on the one hand is the punishment of sin—"The wages of sin is *death;*" the reward, on the other, is the life, the immortality, so invariably promised to the believer—"In hope of eternal life, which God that cannot lie, promised before the world began." (Tit. 1:2.) No other than the literal is possible in the foregoing passa-

ges. Life, immortality, are literally the gift of God through Christ, and consequently not natural; if of grace, then it cannot be of nature; if of nature, then it cannot be of grace. "If Christ be ours, then *all things are ours*," including even this glorious prize of a "crown of life"—immortality. Surely to ascribe the possession of this gift to nature is to rob Christ of the chief jewel in his crown.—*Rainbow.*

THE PRINCIPLE OF INTERPRETATION.

BY HENRY CONSTABLE.

The principle of interpretation is this, that all language relating to law and jurisprudence, all language descriptive of the sanction of government, all language setting forth the penalties of crime and dissobedience, is to be accepted *in its primary sense and in no other.* Examine the terms of any human law, ask the men whose life study relates to law, whether as legislators or administrators—all will reply that in all documents relating directly or indirectly to law and jurisprudence, no sense but the primary is for a moment allowable. Thus, when death is announced as the penalty of a crime, no controversy would for an instant be admitted as to its meaning. No lawyer, for or against the criminal, would search for dramatic or poetical secondary senses. If the criminal himself were gravely to plead that his physical existence should not be taken from him because he had understood the legal penalty of death in a secondary sense, it is quite possible that he might be saved from the scaffold and the hangman, but it would only be by his being sent to a lunatic asylum as an incurable madman!

Here, then, is a great principle of interpretation in use among all mankind. It is that all documents and terms relating to human conduct as affected by law are only to be interpreted in their primary sense. A secondary sense may be more usual and more proper elsewhere, but not here. Poetry and the drama, the literature of passion, imagination, and feeling, may use these terms differently, but their use is not to affect in the smallest degree *the interpretation of a law.* Here we take our stand. Here we are on sure and steady ground. The terms we have been discussing are the terms of the Divine law; the jurisprudence we have been discussing is God's jurisprudence. We only claim that God's penalty for crime against God's law should be interpreted in analogy with all law. It would be an outrage upon human law to interpret its sanction in some figurative and secondary sense; but that God's jurisprudence should be interpreted in this way, his awful penalty of sin explained by the tropes of poetry and the hyperbole of grief, is an outrage of a graver kind, because mixed up with a higher destiny and the Great Judge of the Universe. On this principle, then, we set aside every secondary sense from the terms relative to future punishment. On this principle we accept their primary as here their only possible sense, and on this principle the theories of Augustine and Origen fall together—the theory that inflicts eternal misery on man, and the theory that brings him back through a death to sin to holiness and happiness.

If any justification of this principle were required, it is readily found. The primary sense is *one unchanging sense*, universally understood by every reasonable being at every stage of civilization and every variety of religious belief. The secondary sense is various, changing, differently regarded by different minds. Thus death in its primary sense is always one and the same. Down from its first example and enunciation to the present day it has preserved this sense unbroken and unchanged, and is understood alike by the savage and the civilized, by the ignorant and the learned, by the degraded and the sensitive mind. But when we come to the secondary sense all this is changed. There are several secondary senses! These secondary senses are ever varying with the opinions and circumstances of men. Some of these secondary senses are absolutely unintelligible to multitudes of minds, as those of children, persons of blunted moral feelings, and savages, who yet were all intended to be affected by the terms used.

UMI

"THE DOOM OF THE UNJUST."

Mr. Pridham is the author of treatises upon various parts of Holy Scripture. In the work which we now proceed to review, he comes forward upon a subject on which Holy Scripture treats in every one of its books, the solemn question of the doom of the unjust. One who has studied God's word so closely as Mr. Pridham has done, has a right to be heard upon this point. If such a man can advance no solid proof of the truth of his view, it must indeed be indefensible.

In his preface, Mr. Pridham commends his treatise to the Christian public as an "effort to *maintain the faith.*" We must, then, first draw attention to the one point which, as between him and us, is here in dispute. *Mr. Pridham maintains the eternity of evil and misery in God's world: we hold that both will come to an end.* This is the one point of difference between him and us. We believe in the resurrection, the judgment, and the punishment of the unjust; we hold that their punishment will be eternal in its duration; we hold that it will consist in their everlasting destruction. Mr. Pridham holds that it will consist in an eternal life of anguish and evil. He thinks that "the faith" will be overthrown unless the "eternity of evil" can be established as a truth.

Now we certainly agree with Mr. Pridham, that this great question does vitally affect the Christian faith; but it is the establishment of his view, not of ours, which would place that faith in peril. To suppose that a time is coming when evil shall be abolished by the destruction of evil doers, and when everything that has breath shall praise the Lord, does not appear to us a supposition which can cast any discredit upon our faith. It does not seem to us a dangerous doctrine, or one that casts dishonor upon God, or that encourages man in sin. It presents a view of the future in which every mind taught tenderness, and pity, and love, and holiness, by the renewing of the Holy Spirit, must of necessity rejoice.

But we affirm that the opposite view, as taught by Mr. Pridham and his school, does imperil faith. To our mind it is a proof of the divine character of our religion, that it has been able to progress, or hold its ground at all with a weight that would bring

any other system of religion to the ground. The view that God will, for the sins of time, punish with everlasting agony the creatures of his hand, when a word from him would deprive them of their evil and miserable being, is a view which has made tens of thousands to become infidels, and keeps tens of thousands in infidelity. It is a view, which no mind, upon a calm review, can avoid branding as unjust. It brings before us the God of Revelation as acting in a manner which the reason and conscience he has himself bestowed, pronounce unjust and cruel. Here is, indeed, a grave peril to the faith. Here is a stumbling block to man's reception of the gospel of Christ. Thank God it exists only in a theology based upon a false philosophy, and is not found in his word.

Mr. Pridham, in the very outset of his book, presents his case in an unjustifiable way, viz., *by misrepresenting that of his opponents.* "*Of old*," he tells us, "it was believed that the wicked is driven away in his wickedness, and that God will bring every work into judgment." (5.) He would have his readers think that this is denied by us! We beg leave to tell him that we believe it as much as he, and that every writer on our side maintains it as the truth.

Does he think that there is no punishment except one consisting in eternal anguish? Does he not know that in this world are and have been many punishments, some of them inflicted immediately by God, and none of them of the kind he speaks of? We hope he will cease to misrepresent us and our opinions. We hold that for every evil deed here unpardoned there will be punishment in the world to come; but it will not be of the excessive and unjust character that he contends for. And yet we are held up as deniers of future punishment!

We must tell Mr. Pridham that in this great question on which the Church has now fairly entered, one of the things which controversialists must learn is honesty and truth. We are not to misrepresent each other's views. If we do not know what they are let us learn them before we speak of them at all. Let us describe them as they are. The time has gone by when misrepresentation can do anything but injure the cause which makes use of it. The ear of the Church of Christ is opened to what we have to say. Christian men and women wait to hear what *both* sides have to urge. The press is becoming open to us, a fair field and no favor is all we ask for, and what we certainly will have.

UMI

"THE DOOM OF THE UNJUST."

Mr. Pridham is the author of treatises upon various parts of Holy Scripture. In the work which we now proceed to review, he comes forward upon a subject on which Holy Scripture treats in every one of its books, the solemn question of the doom of the unjust. One who has studied God's word so closely as Mr. Pridham has done, has a right to be heard upon this point. If such a man can advance no solid proof of the truth of his view, it must indeed be indefensible.

In his preface, Mr. Pridham commends his treatise to the Christian public as an "effort to *maintain the faith.*" We must, then, first draw attention to the one point which, as between him and us, is here in dispute. *Mr. Pridham maintains the eternity of evil and misery in God's world: we hold that both will come to an end.* This is the one point of difference between him and us. We believe in the resurrection, the judgment, and the punishment of the unjust; we hold that their punishment will be eternal in its duration; we hold that it will consist in their everlasting destruction. Mr. Pridham holds that it will consist in an eternal life of anguish and evil. He thinks that "the faith" will be overthrown unless the "eternity of evil" can be established as a truth.

Now we certainly agree with Mr. Pridham, that this great question does vitally affect the Christian faith; but it is the establishment of his view, not of ours, which would place that faith in peril. To suppose that a time is coming when evil shall be abolished by the destruction of evil doers, and when everything that has breath shall praise the Lord, does not appear to us a supposition which can cast any discredit upon our faith. It does not seem to us a dangerous doctrine, or one that casts dishonor upon God, or that encourages man in sin. It presents a view of the future in which every mind taught tenderness, and pity, and love, and holiness, by the renewing of the Holy Spirit, must of necessity rejoice.

But we affirm that the opposite view, as taught by Mr. Pridham and his school, does imperil faith. To our mind it is a proof of the divine character of our religion, that it has been able to progress, or hold its ground at all with a weight that would bring

any other system of religion to the ground. The view that God will, for the sins of time, punish with everlasting agony the creatures of his hand, when a word from him would deprive them of their evil and miserable being, is a view which has made tens of thousands to become infidels, and keeps tens of thousands in infidelity. It is a view, which no mind, upon a calm review, can avoid branding as unjust. It brings before us the God of Revelation as acting in a manner which the reason and conscience he has himself bestowed, pronounce unjust and cruel. Here is, indeed, a grave peril to the faith. Here is a stumbling block to man's reception of the gospel of Christ. Thank God it exists only in a theology based upon a false philosophy, and is not found in his word.

Mr. Pridham, in the very outset of his book, presents his case in an unjustifiable way, viz., *by misrepresenting that of his opponents.* "*Of old*," he tells us, "it was believed that the wicked is driven away in his wickedness, and that God will bring every work into judgment." (5.) He would have his readers think that this is denied by us! We beg leave to tell him that we believe it as much as he, and that every writer on our side maintains it as the truth.

Does he think that there is no punishment except one consisting in eternal anguish? Does he not know that in this world are and have been many punishments, some of them inflicted immediately by God, and none of them of the kind he speaks of? We hope he will cease to misrepresent us and our opinions. We hold that for every evil deed here unpardoned there will be punishment in the world to come; but it will not be of the excessive and unjust character that he contends for. And yet we are held up as deniers of future punishment!

We must tell Mr. Pridham that in this great question on which the Church has now fairly entered, one of the things which controversialists must learn is honesty and truth. We are not to misrepresent each other's views. If we do not know what they are let us learn them before we speak of them at all. Let us describe them as they are. The time has gone by when misrepresentation can do anything but injure the cause which makes use of it. The ear of the Church of Christ is opened to what we have to say. Christian men and women wait to hear what *both* sides have to urge. The press is becoming open to us, a fair field and no favor is all we ask for, and what we certainly will have.

UMI

We will not be misrepresented as deniers of future punishment.

At page 6, Mr. Pridham acquaints us with the nature of the argument which he will adopt. He will not occupy himself, he tells us, with "*textual and critical objections*" to his view of future punishment. But we must only tell him, that on the ground which he avoids, this great battle can alone be fought. It is from God's words only that we can form a just idea of the manner in which he proposes to deal with sinners. Mr. Pridham, indeed, gives us a reason why he avoids this ground, but we doubt whether his reason will be accepted as a good one. He tells his readers that our "textual objections" have been "*fully exposed.*" We doubt if the readers of the *Rainbow* will agree with this; or if any one who knows the present state of the question will agree with him. When it is known that we only claim that the words of Scripture be taken in their one primary sense as all language relative to law and justice is interpreted among all mankind, and when it is known that our opponents contend that they should be taken *in some one of their many secondary senses*, we do not think that our case is so "fully exposed" that it needs no further exposure. We stand upon the text of Scripture, upon the Word of God, interpreted as all similar language is universally interpreted. From this ground we have never been driven, and we never can be. From this ground we will attack all our opponents, and overthrow every advocate of the secondary sense, whether of the school of Augustine or of Origen.

But we now come to Mr. Pridham's chosen field of argument. He will show his readers that any other doom for the unjust except one of unending agony is *incompatible* "with a just and worthy view of the person or the work of our Lord Jesus Christ." (6.)

Is he aware of *the nature of his argument?* We scarcely think so. He has decried the claims of natural intellect and conscience to be heard at all in this controversy. (5.) But here, doubtless unawares, he comes forward *with a great rationalistic argument!* He will tell us how great Jesus Christ is, and how glorious his work; and from this he will prove to us that we can suppose no amount of punishment sufficient for one who rejects Christ, except an eternal existence of agony. This is preeminently an argument of reason. Mr. Pridham comes into the very field which philosophy occupied of old. He abandons to

others the words of Scripture, and will give us instead, the deductions of his own reasons.

Well, we are not afraid to meet him, even here. We should not be afraid to meet him on the field of Scripture, where from the previous character of his writings we should have expected to find him. We meet him on his own field. He undertakes to prove that no punishment but endless agony is sufficient for the sinner; we undertake to show that neither reason nor Scripture bears out his fearful code of retribution.

It is in *the malignity of sin* that he sees the necessity for everlasting agony as its punishment. He tells us that he can only form a "just apprehension of the guiltiness of sin" "by a contemplation of that ever blessed remedy by which alone sin is destroyed." (9.) We agree with him. We believe sin to be a fearful thing; and that it deserves God's wrath. We see its malignity nowhere so truly as in the Cross of Christ. No man whatsoever, save and except the man Christ Jesus, ever thought adequately of the evil of sin. So in our premises we do not differ much, if at all, from Mr. Pridham.

In his description of the sinner, he is very graphic. "Man," he tells us, "is mirrored to himself in Scripture as a bankrupt debtor, an imprisoned captive who yet loves his chains; as a hater and active enemy of God; a sinner and the slave of sin, and, by righteous consequence, a child of wrath by nature. He is addressed in varied tones of warning and commiseration, as a guilty outcast, a ruined spendthrift, a fraudulent steward, an unprofitable slave. He is called unthankful and unholy, and is proved to be both teacherous and bloodthirsty, vindictive and deceitful, proud and foolish, hateful and unclean." (10–11.)

What of all this? Why that, according to Mr. Pridham, this: "Man" must continue forever in God's world, hating and blaspheming his Maker! No other punishment is *suitable;* no other punishment is *possible!* He cannot be restored, and therefore an endless existence in pollution and misery must and ought to be his portion!

Is this a good argument? First let us consider whether we could not with greater reason imagine a more *suitable* punishment.

The sinner is a *moral monster*, wicked, incurable, an offence to all that is good and pure! Grant all this. What then? Why, is it not the very first thing that rushes into our minds that the

UMI

best way to deal with this moral monster would *be to get rid of him as completely as possible?* This is what man does with his monsters, with his pollutions, whether of a moral or a physical kind. *The destruction of the monster* would then seem to be the thing that reason would point out as his most suitable punishment! The worse he is, the more urgent his destruction! Reason points clearly to this as the suitable end of sinners.

Now we cannot help thinking that some such thought presented itself to Mr. Pridham's reason as not very unreasonable. We think too highly of his reason not to suspect this. It surely did occur to him that *since the sinner was such a monster as he has described, the best and most suitable punishment would be to remove him out of existence!* We are sure that it occurred to him that to a great many of his readers this thought might and would occur. So in seven brief words he hastens to tell them that this solution is not possible. The destruction of the monster might be very suitable, very desirable, but—alas!—it is not possible.

Why is it not possible? Here is Mr Pridham's reason: "*God's breath is not a perishable thing,*" *and the soul of the sinner is God's breath!* (13.) We thought it would come to this —for to this it must always come with the Augustinian reasoner. The essential or inalienable immortality of the soul is his sheet anchor. This heathen figment introduced Augustine's theory into the church; this heathen figment retains it in Christian belief; with the expulsion of thisheathen figment (and it is being fast expelled), Augustine's theory will quickly take its place among the moles and bats of bygone heresies.

We do not know that Mr. Pridham puts forward his view of the soul as the deduction of reason, but he has presented us with the exact philosophic view which Plato and his school of old, and the Buddhists of Asia, now present. The soul is a part of God and therefore imperishable, and consequently destruction cannot put an end to the sinner! Such is the fearful dogma which he puts forward as the ground of his view of future punishment. He gives us texts of Scripture in proof of it. We will examine his texts, and show him the fearful consequences which would result from the adoption of an ancient heathen error.

In Gen. 2: 7, we read that "God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life." This breath Mr. Pridham considers to be

part of God's own essence, and to be therefore imperishable. This is a very serious thing to put forward. We seldom see this view advanced even by the boldest Augustinian theorists. Its consequences are so fearful, so impious, so impossible, that they shrink from it. We sometimes, however, see it. We lately saw it copied from *The London Christian Times.* As the editor of that paper has given the view more fully than Mr. Pridham, we copy his words that our readers may see the statement. "The soul" says the editor of the *Christian Times*, "*was not the work of God's hands, but an emanation of God's essence.* The living soul with which the body was tenanted was composed, so to speak, of God's breath; and to say that it is not naturally immortal, or that it can be robbed of its immortality, is to say that God, the eternal, who had no beginning, and shall have no end, is tainted with mortality. *The soul of man being a part of God must, in the very nature of things, be immortal.*"

We see here the desperate pleas to which the Augustinian theory is ever forcing its advocates. Are these men aware of what they say? Have they eyes to see the absurd blasphemies to which their interpretation of Scripture leads? If the soul be a part of God, then they must suppose that a part of God *has sinned*, that part of God *blasphemes* God, that part of God is to be eternally punished by God! Such are the inevitable conclusions to which their interpretation of Genesis 2: 7, lead, and which surely they must see to be therefore unsound.

The truth is that Genesis 2: 7, is simply an account of *man's creation* by God, and is expressed in terms similar to the accounts of the creation of the lower animals. That "breath of life" which God is said, in Genesis 2; 7, to have breathed into man, is said in Genesis 7: 21, 22, to have been the possession of "fowl, and cattle, and beast." And Mr. Pridham's famous argument, from Genesis 2: 7, would confer immortality upon every fowl and beast, and creeping thing that has ever lived. Yea, and make their spirit to be as much a part of God as that of man!

Mr. Pridham advances Eccl. 3: 20, as proof of the imperishable nature of the soul. How it proves it we cannot see. It says that man and beast both have spirits. Thus far it seems rather against his view. But the former is said to "*go up,*" and the latter to "*go down.*" How this establishes the immortality of the former we cannot see. We are not sure that we under-

UMI

stand the passage, but we are certain that it is insufficient to establish Mr. Pridham's view.

Eccl. 12 : 7, is equally inconclusive. Solomon seems here to affirm of every human spirit, good or bad, that it returns to God who gave it. This certainly does not establish anything as to the immortality of such spirits, or say a word about it. Mr. Pridham must give better texts than these before he can establish from the Bible the doctrine of Buddha.

At page 14, he gives his grand argument. "*Sin*," he says, "*has to be measured* with reference, not to its agent only, but much more also to its *object*." The argument is this—Sin required the satisfaction of the Son of God to remove it. His nature is an infinite one. Consequently, all who reject him must suffer an eternal agony; nothing less can suit the character of their sin; they have sinned against an "eternal nature," (15) and therefore must suffer throughout eternity.

For ourselves we can only say that we do not see the force of this reasoning. We must remember that this is all Mr. Pridham's logic, and that we are not therefore guilty of any impiety in discussing it as freely as we would discuss the logic of Platonist or Buddhist, whom Mr. Pridham resembles in so many of his ideas. That men incur greater guilt in proportion to the grace against which they offend, we fully admit. If Mr. Pridham will look at ch. 7 of our pamphlet on "Future Punishment," he will find that we fully insisted upon this point. But that the eternal nature of that Father whom the sinner has offended, and of that Son whom he has rejected, is to form the necessary ground for making the sinner suffer anguish during God's endless existence, seems to us a horrible and revolting idea, which we wholly refuse to accept on the authority of Mr. Pridham, or the force of his logic. Exclusion from the blessing of redemption must follow the sinner's course. Regard to the interests of a wide creation—wider than we conceive of—will require that sterner punishment which God will inflict upon some, than upon other sinners; but that the greatness of our God, his endless being, is to make it essential that they who sin willfully against him must suffer agony for every year of his endless being, sounds to our ears false as a logical argument, and diabolical as a moral one. These are indeed the arguments that imperil "the faith." These are the arguments that make infidels by the thousand. Thank

God, they are only the arguments of the scribe, not of the authorized teacher from God.

We think that the idea that the greatness of God only makes him *more merciful, more patient of sins against him*, is much more congenial to true moral grandeur. To suppose that God is to punish to the full extent of his Almighty power is a fearful idea. It does not appear to us the teaching of the Bible. If we were to attribute conduct of this kind *to men* we should create monsters whom we all would abhor. Reason then, which is all that Mr. Pridham *here* goes on, does not justify us in attributing such to God.

Another argument of Mr. Pridham is ingenious, while it is perfectly horrible. He thinks that the "reflecting mind" must see that the *lot of the lost must be the exact converse of that of the redeemed.* "The children of the curse," he says, "must have the opposite to the blessings of the saved." (17.) His argument is that as the redeemed shall have an everlasting life of glory and joy, the lost must have an everlasting life of shame and agony!

When the advocates of Augustine's hell come forward to justify their position they use arguments which, in one mood, produce the smile of contempt, and, in another, create the shudder of horror. If there was anything whatever in Mr. Pridham's argument, which we wholly deny, it would be answered sufficiently by *the loss of the everlasting life* which the redeemed enjoy. Everlasting death is an exact converse to everlasting life.

But Mr. Pridham has yet to learn from God's word *the character of that God* whom his arguments would cover with blackness. *The idea that the lost must receive as much misery as the redeemed do of joy, is an idea utterly rejected by God himself.* Has Mr. Pridham ever heard of a text which tells him that the wicked receive *what they have earned, and the redeemed a wonderful gift?* He will find such a text in Romans 6 : 23. Has he ever heard the hundred texts that teach that God delights to bless, and shuns to take vengeance? Measure the agony of the lost by the bliss of the redeemed! Never! God abhors the diabolical idea!

Will Mr. Pridham's reason never lead him in any direction but that of agony? We should have thought that some of his reasoning might have led him somewhere near our position. Thus he tells us that "if to be *like the Lord* be the climax of his people's hopes, *the contrary to this will be the lot of the condemned.*"

UMI

(17.) Will he allow us to carry out his argument? The wicked are not to be "like the Lord." The Lord is immortal, and not subject to death: therefore, the wicked will not be immortal! Is not this Mr. Pridham's own argument for once taking the turn of mercy? Will he reject it for *that?*

With one of his arguments from Scripture, we fully agree—viz., that the "Spirit of truth insists continually on *the perpetuity of that condition to which God's righteous judgment finally commits his foes.* (20.) If he were arguing against Origen's view of the restoration of the lost, he would be here resistless. But does he no tknow that the "endless death" of those who once had life and might have had it forever, is just as perpetual a condition as endless life? We respectfully ask him to read the second chapter of our pamphlet, in which we have dwelt upon this point. We remind him that those who have known the laws of language as well as he, and whose powers of mind were at least equal, have thus spoken of this very condition. Cicero, Lucretius, Horace, Tertullian, have all spoken of eternal non-existence as a perpetual condition. Mr. Pridham cannot alter human language to give color to a cruel creed.

He asks—"Does the God of truth resort, as a method of persuasion, to empty and unmeaning threats?" (22.) Certainly not. But does he think that all punishment except one of endless agony is but an "empty and unmeaning threat?" We are thankful that God is not of his opinion. The woes brought in this life on the Jews by their sins are described by God as *very terrible* punishments (Deut. 28: 59.) Our Lord describes similar woes in the same way. (Matt. 24: 21.) Hebrews 11: 36, describes the sufferings of God's saints as very terrible. But all this with Mr. Pridham is *nothing.* The resurrection to shame—the awful assize—the banishment to hell—the suffering there, long or short at God's will, before death takes away life—all this is nothing in his most merciful judgment! He reminds us of Draco, except that Draco was a model of compassion compared to him. With Draco there was but one punishment—death: with Mr. Pridham there is but one punishment—endless agony. It is well that our FATHER does not think thus of the sufferings of his creatures!

A misapprehension of our argument we would remove. At page 22, Mr. Pridham supposes that we teach that the punishment of the lost will consist in their "instant extinction by a

flame from heaven." We are aware that there are persons who have taught thus. For ourselves we do *not* hold it. What is more, there is no writer in this country who occupies the position of a leader of thought who holds it. Mr. Pridham will not find it in the writings of Messrs. Davis, Ker, Leask, Litton, Maude, Minton, or White. We have ourselves never seen the view advocated. We hold that there will be life, and anguish, and pain, in hell. We do not pretend to define its length. But hell is with us all a very terrible scene and place. The punishments it will exhibit far exceed those of this life.

In his endeavor to strengthen his position, Mr. Pridham refers to *heathen opinion.* He says that he might "make nature also an opposing witness in this controversy; for the voice of conscience, whenever audible at all, confesses an indefinite futurity of joy or wo." (23.) When will this old mistake be removed? We beg leave to tell him that so far from there being an all but universal belief on the part of heathen nations that all souls would exist for ever either in wo or joy, *it was their all but universal belief that there was no future life at all for good or bad.* Tartarus and Elysium were favorite topics with poets, and favorite themes in schools of philosophy, but were laughed at and rejected by the great mass of mankind, whether educated or ignorant. We dare say that Mr. Pridham will be surprised at this, for he has probably all his life been hearing the contrary. We will, however, lay facts before him, and ask him to correct his opinion. Of all schools of heathen philosophy the *Epicurean* was the most widely prevalent. It denied a future life altogether. But perhaps he may say that the *mass of men* believed it. We hope he will accept the testimony of St Paul, that the mass of men had no such belief. He will find the apostle's testimony to this effect in 1 Thess. 4: 13. Perhaps he would like to see a testimony from an early Christian writer to the same effect. He shall have it from Tertullian, who is the more to be heard here, as he labors to show, as much as possible, that heathen opinion concurred with his notion of the immortality of the soul. In one place he says, "to the belief of this (viz. the resurrection) truth compels us—that truth which God reveals, but the *crowd denies*, which supposes that *nothing will survive after death*;" he adds—"the wise, too, join with the vulgar crowd in their opinion sometimes. *There is nothing after death*, according to the school of Epicurus. After death all things

UMI

come to an end, even death itself, says Seneca, to like effect." (Vol. 2, 215–16 Tertullian. Edition Dr. Roberts.) What then becomes of the universal heathen belief in the immortality of the soul? It is a myth repeated in our ears till we have believed it! The truth is that belief in immortality was *not* a part of heathen belief. Christ came—not to confirm an existing belief—but to restore a faith which had been lost. Mankind in Christ's time believed there would be no future life for any; Christ came to announce that through himself there would be eternal life for his redeemed.

We have thus considered all Mr. Pridham's arguments against our theory of the destruction of the wicked, and seen their utter weakness. With his reasoning against the theory of restoration (pp. 24–6) we have nothing to do except to say that we fully agree with it. Origen's view is in our judgment false, delusive, and most dangerous. We have occupied fully as much of our pamphlet on Future Punishment against Origen's view as against Augustine's. We beg, however, to tell Mr. Pridham that it is *his* views which are forcing good and pious men into the dream of Origen. The idea of eternal evil, of endless misery, is revolting to the mind exactly in proportion as the mind is alive to the feelings of mercy, love, holiness, and justice. We also tell Mr. Pridham, that on *his premise* that the human soul is a part of Deity, Origen's theory of universal restoration is more than able to contend on equal terms with him.

HENRY CONSTABLE.

EDITORIAL.

WE are happy to be able to announce to our readers that by a unanimous vote of the Publishing Association, at its late annual meeting, Eld. JAMES H. WHITMORE was chosen Associate Editor of THE QUARTERLY. He needs no introdoction to our readers, for they have already been made accquainted with his pen. By our united efforts we hope to make THE QUARTERLY eminently worthy of success, a magazine of Advent literature worth buying, worth reading, and worthy of preservation.

WE call the attention of opposers, particularly to two articles in the present number of THE QUARTERLY. The first of these is that upon *the Final Punishment.* It is by a clergyman in good standing in one of the leading denominations of this country, who has been for more than a quarter of a century a careful student of the original languages of the Scriptures, and is well qualified to speak concerning their sense. His name is withheld for the present for valid reasons. Will our "orthodox" readers give their brother a candid hearing upon this subject. He indulges no display of rhetoric, makes no appeal to sympathy, indulges no denunciation of erroneous views of the subject, but goes straight to the work he has proposed, and evolves a Scriptural argument for the final extinction of evil which cannot be gainsaid, however much it may be resisted. And the faith of the Adventists receives a fresh assurance when men of such candor and learning affirm that the original tongues sustain the teaching of the English version of the Bible concerning the extinction of evil from the universe

Mr. Constable, also, furnishes one of his peculiary able and comprehensive reviews, and shows the publishers of Stuart's work on future punishment how little they understood the question at issue when they supposed it would aid them in opposing the spread of "annihilation" views.

We could also wish that his manly challenge for a discussion of this subject might be accepted. We have already offered our pages to one of the gentlemen named by Mr. Constable for a reply to him, and stand ready to extend the courtesy so as to include all whom the Prebendary has included in his friendly challenge. Why will not our learned opponents meet us on our own ground? It is a remarkable fact, that they aim not to convert those who have accepted our views, but to prevent us from making conversions by creating a prejudice, which they evidently hope we may not be able to overcome, and in many cases they are only too successful. That this charge is just, appears from the fact, that in six years we do not remember ever to have received for notice or review, save in one instance, a single copy of book, pamphlet, or tract opposing Adventism. In one case we applied personally at a publishing house of one of the largest churches in the United States, for a copy of a work on the Nature of Man, for review, and were compelled to pay the retail price or go without the book.

On the other hand, our publications are almost universally treated with silent contempt, or if noticed at all, are covered with misrepresentation. On

come to an end, even death itself, says Seneca, to like effect." (Vol. 2, 215–16 Tertullian. Edition Dr. Roberts.) What then becomes of the universal heathen belief in the immortality of the soul? It is a myth repeated in our ears till we have believed it! The truth is that belief in immortality was *not* a part of heathen belief. Christ came—not to confirm an existing belief—but to restore a faith which had been lost. Mankind in Christ's time believed there would be no future life for any; Christ came to announce that through himself there would be eternal life for his redeemed.

We have thus considered all Mr. Pridham's arguments against our theory of the destruction of the wicked, and seen their utter weakness. With his reasoning against the theory of restoration (pp. 24–6) we have nothing to do except to say that we fully agree with it. Origen's view is in our judgment false, delusive, and most dangerous. We have occupied fully as much of our pamphlet on Future Punishment against Origen's view as against Augustine's. We beg, however, to tell Mr. Pridham that it is *his* views which are forcing good and pious men into the dream of Origen. The idea of eternal evil, of endless misery, is revolting to the mind exactly in proportion as the mind is alive to the feelings of mercy, love, holiness, and justice. We also tell Mr. Pridham, that on *his premise* that the human soul is a part of Deity, Origen's theory of universal restoration is more than able to contend on equal terms with him.

HENRY CONSTABLE.

EDITORIAL.

WE are happy to be able to announce to our readers that by a unanimous vote of the Publishing Association, at its late annual meeting, Eld. JAMES H. WHITMORE was chosen Associate Editor of THE QUARTERLY. He needs no introdoction to our readers, for they have already been made accquainted with his pen. By our united efforts we hope to make THE QUARTERLY eminently worthy of success, a magazine of Advent literature worth buying, worth reading, and worthy of preservation.

WE call the attention of opposers, particularly to two articles in the present number of THE QUARTERLY. The first of these is that upon *the Final Punishment*. It is by a clergyman in good standing in one of the leading denominations of this country, who has been for more than a quarter of a century a careful student of the original languages of the Scriptures, and is well qualified to speak concerning their sense. His name is withheld for the present for valid reasons. Will our "orthodox" readers give their brother a candid hearing upon this subject. He indulges no display of rhetoric, makes no appeal to sympathy, indulges no denunciation of erroneous views of the subject, but goes straight to the work he has proposed, and evolves a Scriptural argument for the final extinction of evil which cannot be gainsaid, however much it may be resisted. And the faith of the Adventists receives a fresh assurance when men of such candor and learning affirm that the original tongues sustain the teaching of the English version of the Bible concerning the extinction of evil from the universe

Mr. Constable, also, furnishes one of his peculiary able and comprehensive reviews, and shows the publishers of Stuart's work on future punishment how little they understood the question at issue when they supposed it would aid them in opposing the spread of "annihilation" views.

We could also wish that his manly challenge for a discussion of this subject might be accepted. We have already offered our pages to one of the gentlemen named by Mr. Constable for a reply to him, and stand ready to extend the courtesy so as to include all whom the Prebendary has included in his friendly challenge. Why will not our learned opponents meet us on our own ground? It is a remarkable fact, that they aim not to convert those who have accepted our views, but to prevent us from making conversions by creating a prejudice, which they evidently hope we may not be able to overcome, and in many cases they are only too successful. That this charge is just, appears from the fact, that in six years we do not remember ever to have received for notice or review, save in one instance, a single copy of book, pamphlet, or tract opposing Adventism. In one case we applied personally at a publishing house of one of the largest churches in the United States, for a copy of a work on the Nature of Man, for review, and were compelled to pay the retail price or go without the book.

On the other hand, our publications are almost universally treated with silent contempt, or if noticed at all, are covered with misrepresentation. On

UMI

publishing Collin's ADDRESS to the body which withdrew fellowship from him for his supposed heresy, we sent a copy to every Methodist paper in the country; but less than half a dozen condescended to even acknowledge its receipt.

We do not speak of this to complain, or because we feel badly over it; it was just what we expected.

But if our opponents have so much confidence in their arguments, why not push them upon the parties in the supposed error? THE QUARTERLY is open for any writer whom Andover or Chicago will endorse, to reply to Mr. Constable, or to discuss with him the question he proposes, for the benefit especially of Adventist readers. It is those who are sick who need a physician. Will not some of the Doctors of Divinity embrace this opportunity to "heal" us of our supposed infirmity of faith?

APOLOGY.

Our apology for numerous typographical errors in the present number of THE QUARTERLY, *is the carelessness of the temporary foreman of our printing office, who did the work hastily in the absence of the Editor. They are mortifying to us, but could not be remedied, except by reprinting, which we have not had time to do.*

THE Advent Christian Quarterly.

VOL. II.—JANUARY, 1871.—NO. III.

ANCIENT JEWISH KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING THE FUTURE STATE.

BY EDWARD BALCONER LITTON.

The Jews were God's peculiar people; and among *them*, if not among the other nations of antiquity, the essential immortality of the soul ought certainly to have been known and recognised, and ought to have exercised an active influence upon their life and conduct. After the family of Jacob had become a nation and had suffered during many years the oppression of the Egyptians, it was led forth by God's outstretched arm, was miraculously guided through the wilderness, and finally given the promised land for an inheritance.

The Jewish constitution was framed by Moses, under Divine direction, and laws were established for the regulation of morals, written upon tables of stone by the finger of God himself. To this favored nation were also committed the oracles of God. In the writings of Moses, the Hebrew possessed an authorized narrative of the creation and fall of man; and from it might have learned to look forward to the period when the Messiah should come, and bestow upon mankind that eternal life, which Adam, by transgression had forfeited. Finally, the Jews had present with them prophets, whose inspired writings, as the time drew near, revealed with more and more distinctness the character and mission of the Annointed.

UMI

The Jews then, assuredly, ought to have known this important truth—the soul's natural immortality—if truth

Yet what is the fact? Neither the Mosaic narrative of fall of man and promise of redemption, through the seed of th woman—nor the law—nor the prophetic writings, announce, as a truth to be recognised, the essential immortality of the soul. The fact is, to say the least, remarkable. Indeed, if the soul be immortal, in the sense commonly alleged, it is well nigh incomprehensible. The sanctions of God's moral law, as delivered to the Jewish nation, are entirely of a temporal character; and so far as obedience was induced, or disobedience reprobated, no such punishment, as the eternal existence of the soul in torment in a future state, is announced or revealed. To repeat: the eternal existence of the soul in a future state, which, in popular estimation, supplies so great an inducement to obedience, *was unknown to the Jewish economy*—an economy of Divine institution. On the contrary; temporal punishments were announced as the result of disobedience, and temporal rewards as the recompense for devotion, to the Supreme Being. "Honor thy father and thy mother," is an example illustrative of the entire law, in which the reward for so doing is immediately stated, namely: "that thy days may be long upon the land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee." (Ex. 20:12.)

There is abundant proof of the correctness of this remark. References are given in the note[1] which the reader can at his leisure consult. The following may, however, be taken as characteristic of the entire.

TEMPORAL REWARDS.

"If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord.... I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians." (Ex. 15:27; Deut. 7:15.)

"He shall bless thy bread and thy water; and I will take sickness away from the midst of thee." (Ex. 23:25.)

"Ye shall dwell in the land in safety." (Lev. 25:18.)

"The land shall yield her fruit, and ye shall eat your fill, and dwell therein in safety." (Lev. 25:19.)

"Ye shall chase your enemies, and they shall fall before you by the sword." (Lev. 26:7.)

TEMPORAL PUNISHMENTS.

"I will even appoint over you terror corruption, and the burning ague, that shall consume the eyes, and cause sorrow of heart: and ye shall sow

[1] Ex. 15:26; 20:12; 23:22–31; Lev. 25:18; Num. 14:22; 32:11; 33:55; Deut. 1:35, 4:1; 5:29; 6:2, 3; 7:19, 20; 8:1, &c.; 15:4, &c.; 16:20; 17:19; 28:1, &c.; 29:22, 23; 30:1; 31:16–18; 32:23–25.

your seed in vain; for your enemies shall eat it." (Lev. 26:16.)

"Ye shall be slain before your enemies." (Lev. 26:17.)

"Your land shall not yield her increase, neither shall the trees of the land yield their fruits." (Lev. 26:20.)

Whatever, then, may have been the reason, the condition or existence of the soul in a future state, formed no part of the sanction of the Divine Law, as delivered to the Jews.

Is it, however, contended that the Jews had no source of knowledge regarding a future state? By no means. The knowledge of the existence of a future state does not, however, involve a belief in, or the reality of, the essential immortality of the soul. The Jews certainly did possess intimations—indistinct, but not uncertain—that God had in store the gift of immortality ready to be conferred upon his people, and to be procured, in some way or other, by the coming Messiah. But the intimations which conveyed this truth, suggested no grounds whence they could have concluded, *nor did they conclude*, that God had also prepared a state of torment, in which the souls of the lost should exist eternally in misery and pain.

It was not from the Law, that the Jew might have derived his knowledge of a future state, so far as such knowledge was possessed. It was from the Mosaic record of the fall, from the promise subsequently made by God as recorded in that narrative, and from the announcements of the various prophets, who from time to time testified of the coming Savior. It is important to bear in mind that the Law did not afford any knowledge of a future state; that it did not convey to the minds of the people the existence of such a state, so as to satisfy them of its reality. It was otherwise with the ordinances of religion, the ceremonials of which were typical of the "better things" included in the New Covenant; but then their character nor meaning were neither realized nor understood.

Intimations given in the Mosaic writings, and references made by the prophets to the Messiah, construed by the light of Gospel truth, speak of a hereafter. But in what sense were they understood by the Jew? Assuredly not as they should have been accepted; for then THE CHRIST would not have been rejected, when he came. It was undoubtedly alone through faith in the promises, afterwards fulfilled by him who is to bruise the Serpent's head, that the Jew, in times of old, could look for redemption. Faith in the promises according to their true import, was accounted for righteousness, and comprised reconciliation and acceptance

with God. Instances of particular individuals who looked forward to the Messiah in his character of a Savior from the consequences of the fall, and the penalty of sin, are abundant, from the earliest times down to the period when the law was about to vanish away. Abraham rejoiced to see Christ's day, and he saw it, and was glad; and so with many others: but to the people at large—to the Jewish nation as such, it was otherwise. The promise of a Messiah the Jews certainly accepted; but of his character, and the object of his mission—to purchase redemption for his people, and to take away the sins of the world—they were, as certainly, ignorant. They looked for an earthly sovereign, under whose rule their nation should attain pre-eminence and stability; and so impressed were their minds with the temporal nature of his mission—so foreign to their ideas was a future spiritual kingdom,[1] of which Christ was to be at once the Author and King—so little did they think that the gift which he came to bestow, was eternal life in a future state—that even those who acknowledged the "desire of all nations" in the person of the lowly Jesus, even his disciples, were ignorant of the truth; and, with minds yet unenlightened, inquired; "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?"[2] although he had previously, in express language, declared, "My kingdom is not of this world."[3] After his resurrection also, the two disciples to whom he appeared as they journeyed to Emmaus, gave similar expression to the hopes they had cherished. "They trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel."[4]

It is easier to understand the ignorance which prevailed among the Jews concerning the person and mission of Christ, than it is to account for the want of knowledge which existed regarding the certainty of a future state, *especially* if the essential immortality of the soul was expressly revealed in the Old Testament, or generally known and accepted as a truth. And yet such was the case; for when Christ spoke of his coming death and resurrection, his disciples questioned what the rising of the dead should mean; and after the fact had been attested by many infallible proofs, there were not wanting those, even among professing Christians, who thought that the resurrection had already passed.

[1] By spiritual kingdom we do not understand a kingdom of spirits, but the glorified, eternal state, or the world to come, into which nothing of a carnal nature may enter.—Ed.

[2] Acts 1 : 6. [3] John 18 : 36. [4] Luke 24 : 21.

The more intelligent classes among the Jews appear to have been almost equally divided in opinion upon this very question. The Sadducees—a very influential body, which formed no inconsiderable portion of the council before which Paul was arraigned, and whose members were eligible to the office of High Priest itself—a sect, no doubt, well skilled in the law, well acquainted with the prophetic writings, and versed in all the traditions of their nation—avowed their unbelief in the reality of a resurrection, and in the existence of either angel or spirit.[1] They consequently could not have believed in the natural immortality of the soul; and the fact that such views were entertained by any respectable portion of the community, is sufficient to establish that the Old Testament Scriptures *afforded no certain knowledge* in regard to the soul's future being; for were it otherwise, the Sadducee would have had no show of reason in support of his error.

Is it possible to account in any way for the prevalence of this error—one which so widely prevailed? May it not be referred to the principle, that extreme opinions in one direction are calculated to engender extreme opinions in the opposite direction? so that, if some were found ready to assert the natural immortality of *all* souls, others were not wanting, to deny the immortality of *any*. The Sadducees, rejecting the doctrine that all souls must exist hereafter—an opinion which (requiring the everlasting misery of the great majority of the human race), it may be supposed, they conceived at variance with God's revealed character and intentions—fell into the error of denying the possibility of eternal life being possessed by any. The truth lay between the two extremes: God was the God of the living,[2] and every soul which possesseth life, either in this world or the next, must live in him; but it does not on that account follow that all souls must live hereafter, and therefore continue in either endless happiness or endless woe.

The reference made by Christ, when he upbraided the Sadducees for their great error, and with "not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God,"[3] justifies the view now urged. Christ makes the inquiry—"Have ye not read that which was spoken

[1] Acts 23 : 8. [2] Matt. 22 : 31. [3] Matt. 22 : 32.

UMI

with God. Instances of particular individuals who looked forward to the Messiah in his character of a Savior from the consequences of the fall, and the penalty of sin, are abundant, from the earliest times down to the period when the law was about to vanish away. Abraham rejoiced to see Christ's day, and he saw it, and was glad; and so with many others: but to the people at large—to the Jewish nation as such, it was otherwise. The promise of a Messiah the Jews certainly accepted; but of his character, and the object of his mission—to purchase redemption for his people, and to take away the sins of the world—they were, as certainly, ignorant. They looked for an earthly sovereign, under whose rule their nation should attain pre-eminence and stability; and so impressed were their minds with the temporal nature of his mission—so foreign to their ideas was a future spiritual kingdom,[1] of which Christ was to be at once the Author and King—so little did they think that the gift which he came to bestow, was eternal life in a future state—that even those who acknowledged the "desire of all nations" in the person of the lowly Jesus, even his disciples, were ignorant of the truth; and, with minds yet unenlightened, inquired; "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?"[2] although he had previously, in express language, declared, "My kingdom is not of this world."[3] After his resurrection also, the two disciples to whom he appeared as they journeyed to Emmaus, gave similar expression to the hopes they had cherished. "They trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel."[4]

It is easier to understand the ignorance which prevailed among the Jews concerning the person and mission of Christ, than it is to account for the want of knowledge which existed regarding the certainty of a future state, *especially* if the essential immortality of the soul was expressly revealed in the Old Testament, or generally known and accepted as a truth. And yet such was the case; for when Christ spoke of his coming death and resurrection, his disciples questioned what the rising of the dead should mean; and after the fact had been attested by many infallible proofs, there were not wanting those, even among professing Christians, who thought that the resurrection had already passed.

[1] By spiritual kingdom we do not understand a kingdom of spirits, but the glorified, eternal state, or the world to come, into which nothing of a carnal nature may enter.—ED.

[2] Acts 1:6. [3] John 18:36. [4] Luke 24:21.

The more intelligent classes among the Jews appear to have been almost equally divided in opinion upon this very question. The Sadducees—a very influential body, which formed no inconsiderable portion of the council before which Paul was arraigned, and whose members were eligible to the office of High Priest itself—a sect, no doubt, well skilled in the law, well acquainted with the prophetic writings, and versed in all the traditions of their nation—avowed their unbelief in the reality of a resurrection, and in the existence of either angel or spirit.[1] They consequently could not have believed in the natural immortality of the soul; and the fact that such views were entertained by any respectable portion of the community, is sufficient to establish that the Old Testament Scriptures *afforded no certain knowledge* in regard to the soul's future being; for were it otherwise, the Sadducee would have had no show of reason in support of his error.

Is it possible to account in any way for the prevalence of this error—one which so widely prevailed? May it not be referred to the principle, that extreme opinions in one direction are calculated to engender extreme opinions in the opposite direction? so that, if some were found ready to assert the natural immortality of *all* souls, others were not wanting, to deny the immortality of *any*. The Sadducees, rejecting the doctrine that all souls must exist hereafter—an opinion which (requiring the everlasting misery of the great majority of the human race), it may be supposed, they conceived at variance with God's revealed character and intentions—fell into the error of denying the possibility of eternal life being possessed by any. The truth lay between the two extremes: God was the God of the living,[2] and every soul which possesseth life, either in this world or the next, must live in him; but it does not on that account follow that all souls must live hereafter, and therefore continue in either endless happiness or endless woe.

The reference made by Christ, when he upbraided the Sadducees for their great error, and with "not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God,"[3] justifies the view now urged. Christ makes the inquiry—"Have ye not read that which was spoken

[1] Acts 23:8. [2] Matt. 22:31. [3] Matt. 22:32.

unto you by God; saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."[1] Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were God's holy men of old; they represented God's faithful people —the children of the promises, who should inherit eternal life. "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." In other words, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, representing and including the entire class of believers, are asserted to be the living: God is their God, and they are his people. Not so with regard to those who belong not to the spiritual seed of faithful Abraham; they are the dead. God is not their God: he is not the God of the dead, but of the living. He is not the God of those who are without Christ—that is, now dead though living, who shall receive in a future state the wages of sin—eternal death. *The reference is altogether to a future state.* Eternal life as the gift of God for the saved—eternal death as the wages of sin for the lost, was, then, the truth of which it is written, "when the multitudes heard this they were astonished at his doctrine."[2]

The opinions which prevailed among the Jews at the period of Christ's appearing, owe their origin in no small degree to the philosophy of the Greeks, and particularly to that of Plato. The Old Testament Scriptures were referred to, in support of the views thus derived, rather than as sufficient to justify them. Dodwell, in his treatise on the soul—a work which, in some respects, supports the view urged in the present inquiry, in that he denies that the soul possesses any natural or essential immortality—remarks: "Really the opinions then received among the Jews are a sufficient proof that they knew of no divine revela-

[1]Matt. 22: 23—32.

[2]Abp. Whately is much clearer on this point. He says:

"In our Lord's answer to the Sadducees, he alludes not to any separate state of consciousness, but to *the resurrection.* That Jehovah is called the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, he adduces as proof 'that *the dead are raised.*' If there had been any thought in his mind, or in that of his hearers, of an *actual* state of conscious existence of the departed, I can hardly think that he would have used, or that his hearers would have admitted, such an argument for a resurrection. For they might have replied—It is true God is not a God of the dead, but of the living; and this does seem some indication that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were, and are living, in a state of separation from the body; but it does not follow that they are *hereafter* to obtain a *resurrection!* But his words seem plainly to show that the only question was,

tion concerning the future state of the soul;"[1] and Whately, in his essay, writes: "It is highly probable that the belief of a future state, as it prevailed among the Jews in our Lord's time, and for a considerable period before, was not, properly speaking, drawn from their Scriptures in the first instance; was not founded on the few faint hints to be met with in their prophets, though these were evidently called in to support it; but was the gradual result of a combination of other causes with these imperfect revelations."[2] Again, the celebrated Joseph Mede states "that he knows not on what passage the Jews of old could have formed a belief in a future state except upon the one passage in Daniel."[3] Upon this passage some observations will be ventured at a subsequent page.

Guided by the light of the New Testament, the Mosaic and Prophetic writings can be read at the present day with an understanding of their proper import which the Jews of old could not have possessed. Intimations of the Divine purpose, and language which, clearly enough to the Christian, points out the reality of a future state and the destiny of the soul, can be referred to in the Old Testament. But while many such passages may be recognised, setting forth the promise of eternal life and its anticipated enjoyment, the language of others describes the ultimate faith of the ungodly, as that of destruction and death. This is manifestly the case, unless indeed the words are understood as used in a non-natural sense, or in one different from the usual and popular signification of the terms—a course of construction which, ought not to be adopted and cannot be justified. At the present stage of the inquiry such a construction—the non-natural one—is not demanded on any sufficient grounds; and consequently in the following passages, which are characteristic of those prevailing throughout the Old Testament, the terms should receive their ordinary signification:

"They go to *nothing* and *perish.*" (Job 6: 18.)
"That the wicked is reserved to the day of *destruction;* they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath." (Job 21: 30.)
"Hell is naked before him, and *destruction* hath no covering." (Job 26: 6.)
"Is not *destruction* to the *wicked?*" (Job 31: 3.)
"The way of the ungodly shall *perish.*" (Ps. 1: 6.)
"For the redemption of their soul is precious, and it ceaseth *for ever.*" (Ps. 49: 8.)

whether this present life be the whole of our existence, or whether there is to be a resurrection."

[1]Dodwell on the Soul, p. 111. A. D. 1706. [2]2 ch. 12: 2.

"Man that is in honor, and understandeth not, is *like the beasts that perish*." (Ps. 49:20.)

"For thou hast delivered my soul from *death*." (Ps. 56:13, 116:8.)

"*Destruction* shall be to the workers of iniquity." (Prov. 10:29.)

"Hell and *destruction* are before the Lord." (Prov. 15:11.)

"I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God: wherefore turn yourselves and live ye." (Ezk. 18:32.)

"I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem from *death*." (Hos. 13:14.)

Examples such as the foregoing might be multiplied to no end. They manifestly speak of the end of the wicked—not in regard to this world, but in regard to the next;—not as to their temporal condition, but as to the destiny of their souls. If taken in their ordinary and natural signification, it is impossible to mistake their import. They reiterate the assurance—"the soul that sinneth, it shall die."

With regard to the passage from Daniel, referred to by Mede, in the passage already quoted; there is in it a plain intimation of the resurrection, the judgment, and a future state; but the passage is far indeed from asserting the eternal existence of the soul in torment. The statement reads: "and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Nothing can be plainer than that the "everlasting contempt" to which it is said the wicked shall awake, is a contempt *towards* them, not experienced by them; while the shame is that felt by them, not exhibited *towards* them. The shame is subjective, while the contempt is objective. The shame is theirs, the contempt is the contempt of others. Those who believe not, shall at *that* day be ashamed, and the object of "everlasting contempt." Does not the language coincide with that quoted by Paul: "Whosoever believeth on him, shall not be ashamed,"[1] and with the words of John, when he says: "And now, little children, abide in him; that when he shall appear, we may have confidence and not be ashamed before him, at his coming."[2] As those who awake to life, shall enjoy immortality, so shall the rest be overwhelmed with "everlasting contempt" in the presence of the angels of God.

Thus then, while the ancient Jew possessed but scanty means of acquiring correct and distinct knowledge regarding a future state and the final destiny of the soul, he yet possessed sufficient light to distinguish through the darkness, the outline of a great

[1]Rom. 10:11. [2]1 John 2:28.

and momentous truth, looming in the distant future. The faint memories of what had been lost, and the expectation of again receiving eternal life at the hands of God, through the reconciliation to be effected by the Messiah, afforded for those who look forward to its attainment, sufficient evidence of the indistinct foreshadowing. As the period of Christ's appearing drew near, the dark clouds which concealed the prospect began to clear away. The feeble light of dawn brightened as the approach of day, until finally the arrival of the Sun of righteousness dispelled the last trace of darkness, and revealed in its full splendor—IMMORTALITY, the gift of God conferred upon the redeemed soul, through Jesus Christ, in whom preeminently, was life, and whose "life was the light of men."—*Sel.*

SATAN'S ESTIMATE OF SIN.

"Ye shall not surely die." (Gen. 3:4.)

Satan is the speaker here. God has scarcely finished speaking when Satan gets up. His object is to undo all that God had said. How he found his way into paradise we know not; but here he is. His presence bodes no good. To do God and man as much damage as possible is his object. By force or fraud he is resolved to do it.

He is the tempter, the adversary, the destroyer; but here he appears as an angel of light, the friend of humanity, a wise philanthropist, taking man's part against God. He is a teacher too, a prophet prophesying smooth things; a preacher, zealous in propagating his peculiar doctrines, bent on making proselytes.

He is not the *first* preacher, for God had already spoken. Yes; God's words are first. God is the first preacher. Yet the congregation in both cases is the same. It was not large; but it was influential—being, according to the modern phrase, a "representative" congregation. At most it consisted of *two*, perhaps only one, for "the serpent said *to the woman*."

Our text, then, is the words of the devil; words, however, inserted in this book by the Spirit of God for our instruction. God takes Satan's words and holds them up to view. From this

text Satan must have preached a most effective discourse, whether long or short; for the results of it were not only seen immediately on his hearers, but have been felt in all ages ever since, and are telling on the whole world to this day. It is not many ministers or sermons that meet with such success, or produce such abiding impressions.

This preacher has since become very notable, and has preached many a sermon, through many an instrument, to many a congregation, on many a text—sometimes on the very words of Scripture; in most cases with success. He has many arguments, many devices; he is "full of subtlety," a thorough sophist and Jesuit; bold withal, audaciously contradicting God and denying his word. He is unwearied; the most diligent of all bishops, as old Latimer called him; yet a wolf in sheep's clothing.

But let us study his sermon, for we shall find in it the basis or elements of all false doctrine since that day. It consists of *denials*, indicating its affinity to the negative theology of other ages, from the negative theology of the fool who says there is no God, to that of him who says no law, no sacrifice, no judgment, no Bible.

I. *It is a denial of the truth of God.*—He flatly contradicts the Divine threat, making God a liar and his word an untruth. His object is to destroy man's belief in God's sincerity, whether in threatening or promising; to insinuate that he does not mean what he says, either in his love or his righteousness. If he loves, why does he threaten? If he threatens, does he, can he love? Unkindness and untruthfulness are suggested here, as implied in God's language and dealings toward the sinner. He must either be untruthful or unloving; or rather he must be both. The conclusions which he would have man draw from this denial are these: (1) Do not trust him; (2) do not obey him; (3) do not be afraid of him; (4) do not love him. Such is the denial, and such are its practical lessons. And it is the same denial that he is now uttering to us, thereby to call forth "the evil heart of unbelief." For it is upon that he works; persuading us that God is a liar, that his testimony is not credible, either as regards his law or his gospel, his righteousness or his love.

II. *It is a denial of the evil of sin.*—Whether God would carry out his threat or not, was not the question; he had uttered it; that was enough. Man must stand in awe; and to say to

him you need not fear the execution of the threat, was saying there is no evil, no harm, no danger in disregarding it;—venture and see. Besides, it is evident that God had fixed the penalty of death as the measure of the evil of sin, and Satan, in discrediting the penalty, was denying the evil of which it was intended to be the mark and the measure. He was doing the following things: (1) Denying sin as guilt or an offence. Sin as simple disobedience to God, he did not deny; he wished to bring it to pass. Sin as *guilt*, needing punishment or inferring wrath, he did deny. (2) Denying the exceeding sinfulness of sin. It could not deserve *such* a penalty. Sin was not such a bad thing after all. Thus, in denying its sinfulness, he was denying God's estimate of sin, and saying to man, it may be a bad thing, but not so bad as God makes it. (3) Denying the greatness of little sins. Even were sin an infinite enormity, this sin was so small as hardly to deserve the name! Ye shall not surely die for such a sin as this. It is the same to this day. Satan's object is to set aside God's estimate of sin; to persuade men that sin is not so great an evil as the Bible affirms; that it is a misfortune or disease rather than guilt, chiefly owing to those natural propensities which God has put within us. Hence the need of the law to give us the knowledge of sin; hence the need of Sinai to show us God's hatred of sin and wrath against it. Hence the need of the Holy Spirit to convince of sin and righteousness and judgment. Under the specious names of little sins, harmless amusements, youthful pleasures, what a world of evil lies hidden!

III. *It is a denial of all punishment for sin.*—"Ye shall not surely die;" that is, no punishment for sin; no death, either temporal or eternal. Nay, sin is a good, not an evil; it will introduce you into wisdom, from which God is shutting you out. God is working on your fears, in order to keep you ignorant. Be not afraid. Ye shall not die. Defy God and live! Defy God and be wise.

It is remarkable that the doctrine of future punishment should be the first that was denied. Before Satan taught Cain to reject the blood, he taught Adam to deny the guilt and penalty of sin. It must be a doctrine of no common magnitude, thus set in the front of departures from the truth.

It is remarkable that Satan should be the first denier of this. The opinions in subsequent ages subversive of the doctrine of future punishment may be thus traced to him as their author.

UMI

He was the first to say there is no death and no hell. Not that he believes what he preaches, for we know that the devils believe and tremble; they cry, "Torment us not before our time." But hating God with deep hatred, he does his utmost to injure him; and hating man no less, he would fain blind him to the consequences of disobedience, and bring him into the same condemnation as himself, by telling him what he of all others best knew to be a falsehood.

His is the negative theology; the theology which denies everything which it does not wish, or does not find convenient, to believe. He belongs to the Broad-Church School; and all the misbeliefs or one-sided teachings of that school are to be found in the terse and audacious enunciation of our text, "Ye shall not surely die." Only he speaks out more intelligibly than many of his followers do. We know exactly what he means. His object is to contradict God flatly, to give him the lie, to proclaim to the creature that the Creator's word is not to be credited, and thus to ruin man and to defeat the purpose of God.

He is one that does not believe in inspiration, that does not "tremble at the Word." He sets God's direct word at defiance, making it to mean the very reverse of what it was intended to do. Some of our modern assailants of his revelation say, "Oh had we proof that the words were really divine, we should at once own them and receive their whole significance." Here is their own father rejecting words which had come but yesterday from the lips of God; misinterpreting them, spiritualising them, contradicting them, explaining them away so as to suit his purpose. What the father did, that the sons have done and will do; only it suits them as yet to say that they do not reject God's words, but only what men have called by that name. "Ye are of your father the devil, and the works of your father ye will do."

[1]This also proves another thing: that the devils had a more correct theology of future punishment than that large class in the church at the present day who arrogate to themselves the titles of "Orthodox" and "Evangelical." In Christ's day the future punishment *had not come*. "Art thou come to torment us *before the time?*" asked the demons. But the generally accepted theory announces that the demons, with souls of wicked men, had even in Christ's day been peopleing "hell" for thousands of years. While the devils "believe and tremble," they have never become so bewildered with fear as to place the execution of sentence before judgment or *future* punishment in the *past* and *present*. They know that their "end is destruction," the "wages of sin, death;" hence they fear not a continuance of their present estate, but extinction of all conscious being. (Mark 1: 23; Luke 4: 34; Heb. 2: 14.)—Ed.

He abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him; when he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it."

The above has been his frequent and favorite text and topic in many ages, more or less openly. He suits himself to those with whom he has to do. He reasons the philosopher into the belief that there is no hell, by arguments about the goodness of God; and he is perpetually suggesting to the inquirer, and even to the sinner,—What if there be no Bible, no death, no hell? But as questions such as these betray their authorship—their paternity, and connect themselves at once with the first temptation, there ought to be no difficulty in repelling them. Shall the devil be more credible than God? shall we trust Satan when he says, "Ye shall not surely die," more than Christ when he says, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?"

The denial of future punishments is not then a doctrine according to godliness. It was devised in hell by the prince of hell, for the purpose of leading men to hell. Its tendencies are evil and not good. It looks mild and pitiful, but it is one of the most cruel of doctrines. It deceives men on the most momentous of all points. It misleads men as to the character of God, saying that he is too good-natured to punish; as to the nature of sin; as to the need and certainty of judgment to come; as to the magnitude of the crime of disobedience; as to man's danger because of transgression.

It cannot but strike us strongly that the denial of future punishment was the grand argument by which Satan prevailed in ruining humanity. He saw it in God's face against disobedience, and he set himself to throw it down. He succeeded. Man believed him rather than God, and so sin entered; the floodgates were thrown open; the deluge overflowed. What did man gain by crediting Satan's falsehood? What has the world gained by man's adopting the devil's doctrine as to death and hell? Has it bettered itself? Has it warded off death? Has it shut the gate of hell? Have death and hell ceased to exist by disbelief of their existence? Ah! what will disbelief of judgment do for us? Will it either postpone or prevent it? Will

[illegible] there is no use for a judgment to come. If men [illegible] at death, all the questions of the world to come are [illegible] judgment cannot be executed upon them as men [illegible] are rewarded now, they cannot *receive* the reward hereafter.—Ed.

He was the first to say there is no death and no hell. Not that he believes what he preaches, for we know that the devils believe and tremble; they cry, "Torment us not before our time." But hating God with deep hatred, he does his utmost to injure him; and hating man no less, he would fain blind him to the consequences of disobedience, and bring him into the same condemnation as himself, by telling him what he of all others best knew to be a falsehood.

His is the negative theology; the theology which denies everything which it does not wish, or does not find convenient, to believe. He belongs to the Broad-Church School; and all the misbeliefs or one-sided teachings of that school are to be found in the terse and audacious enunciation of our text, "Ye shall not surely die." Only he speaks out more intelligibly than many of his followers do. We know exactly what he means. His object is to contradict God flatly, to give him the lie, to proclaim to the creature that the Creator's word is not to be credited, and thus to ruin man and to defeat the purpose of God.

He is one that does not believe in inspiration, that does not "tremble at the Word." He sets God's direct word at defiance, making it to mean the very reverse of what it was intended to do. Some of our modern assailants of his revelation say, "Oh had we proof that the words were really divine, we should at once own them and receive their whole significance." Here is their own father rejecting words which had come but yesterday from the lips of God; misinterpreting them, spiritualising them, contradicting them, explaining them away so as to suit his purpose. What the father did, that the sons have done and will do; only it suits them as yet to say that they do not reject God's words, but only what men have called by that name. "Ye are of your father the devil, and the works of your father ye will do.

[1]This also proves another thing: that the devils had a more correct theology of future punishment than that large class in the church at the present day who arrogate to themselves the titles of "Orthodox" and "Evangelical." In Christ's day the future punishment *had not come*. "Art thou come to torment us *before the time*?" asked the demons. But the generally accepted theory announces that the demons, with souls of wicked men, had even in Christ's day been peopleing "hell" for thousands of years. While the devils "believe and tremble," they have never become so bewildered with fear as to place the execution of sentence before judgment, or *future* punishment in the *past* and *present*. They know that their "end is destruction," the "wages of sin, death;" hence they fear not a continuance of their present estate, but extinction of all conscious being. (Mark 1: 23; Luke 4: 34; Heb. 2: 14.)—Ed.

He abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him; when he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it."

The above has been his frequent and favorite text and topic in many ages, more or less openly. He suits himself to those with whom he has to do. He reasons the philosopher into the belief that there is no hell, by arguments about the goodness of God; and he is perpetually suggesting to the inquirer, and even to the sinner,—What if there be no Bible, no death, no hell? But as questions such as these betray their authorship—their paternity, and connect themselves at once with the first temptation, there ought to be no difficulty in repelling them. Shall the devil be more credible than God? shall we trust Satan when he says, "Ye shall not surely die," more than Christ when he says, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?"

The denial of future punishments is not then a doctrine according to godliness. It was devised in hell by the prince of hell, for the purpose of leading men to hell. Its tendencies are evil and not good. It looks mild and pitiful, but it is one of the most cruel of doctrines. It deceives men on the most momentous of all points. It misleads men as to the character of God, saying that he is too good-natured to punish; as to the nature of sin; as to the need and certainty of judgment to come; as to the magnitude of the crime of disobedience; as to man's danger because of transgression.

It cannot but strike us strongly that the denial of future punishment was the grand argument by which Satan prevailed in ruining humanity. He saw it in God's fence against disobedience, and he set himself to throw it down. He succeeded. Man believed him rather than God, and so sin entered; the floodgates were thrown open; the deluge overflowed. What did man gain by crediting Satan's falsehood? What has the world gained by man's adopting the devil's doctrine as to death and hell? Has it bettered itself? Has it warded off death? Has it shut the gate of hell? Have death and hell ceased to exist by disbelief of their existence? Ah! what will disbelief of judgment do for us? Will it either postpone or prevent it? Will

[1]There is no need for a judgment to come if men receive their rewards at death, either the righteous or the wicked. If the wicked are now punished, judgment cannot be executed upon them at any future time. If the righteous are rewarded now, they cannot receive the reward hereafter.—Ed.

the lightning not strike us, because we have demonstrated its non-existence? Will wrath or judgment not overtake us, because we have persuaded ourselves that they are unworthy of a loving God? Will disease cease to waste and pain us; will death withdraw its dart; will the grave give up its victim, because we have proved to ourselves that they are incompatible with the love of God?

The contention here, then, is between God and the devil; between God's affirmation and the devil's contradiction. Let him who denies future punishment, know exactly the authority for his denial. Let him have the honesty to own it too. Let him avow that he gives credit to Satan's statement—"Ye shall not surely die," in preference to God's—"Ye shall surely die."[1]

The doctrine of future punishment is a far more important one than men imagine. Satan knew this, and laid his plans accordingly. God evidently laid great stress upon it; and Satan did the same. The history of our world has been a history of the consequences of denying it. Who can tell what man and man's earth might have been, had our first father believed God's word, "Ye shall surely die?" It is a fearful thing to make light of death and hell. That doctrine was the "*articulus stantis aut cadentis mundi.*" Let us beware how we deal with it it; let us beware of supposing that we may deny it, and yet hold fast redemption by the Cross of Christ.

For in such case, what would redemption be? Redemption from what? From nothing! No death, no hell. And what would the love of God be? Nothing. A poor, feeble, unmeaning sentiment, doing nothing for us, and indeed, not needing to do anything. And what would the Cross of Christ be? A waste of suffering, cruel and unmeaning, seeing the case was by no means so desperate as we have been accustomed to suppose it. Surely, if the consequences of sin be not so terrible and so eternal as Scripture represents them, then Christ has died in vain; and the suggested lie of the old serpent has been founded truth,—"Ye shall not surely die."—*Sel.*

[1]It is to be deeply regretted that those who really or in effect deny future punishment are not the only ones who take Satan's side in this dispute. If the more popular belief be true, God used a figure of speech, and the devil told the plain truth. He only said, "Ye shall *not* surely die." The current theology is that men do not die, and that death *as a penalty* is *life in woe*—all men *live forever* in some condition. Taking the ground that this theology is true, the most that can be said of Satan's declaration is, that he did not tell the *whole* truth: he was right as far as he spoke. We may reasonably doubt if there would have been any deniers of future punishment, had not the general credit given to Satan's falsehood made the dogma of eternal woe and sin a necessity. *That* monstrous doctrine, so unreasonable and unbelievable is the substructure of all Universalism and Restorationism.

IS THE SOUL A SEPARATE ENTITY?

Zion's Herald of August 11, 1870, contains an elaborate argument in support of the two-fold nature of man.[1] In the presentation of his side of the question, the writer has exhibited unusual ability, and though we differ very widely from him in his conclusions, we none the less admire the earnest and confident manner in which he states his own positions, and the refreshing vigor with which he attacks those of his opponents. So far as candor and fairness are concerned, however, the writer is not to be praised. He assigns his opponents to that class of infidels of which Hume and Hobbes are the specified leaders. He thinks "it must be obvious that the materialism which just now clamors for the sanctions of the Bible, and the honor of the Christian name, logically strikes at the foundation of all morals and religion." We do not recollect ever to have read an argument against materialism that did not associate it with infidelity. If immaterialism is so weak that its advocates are compelled to leave the field of fair argumentation and appeal to popular prejudice by confounding Bible materialism with French atheism, German infidelity, or English skepticism, then it had better be abandoned at once, for no cause is worth sustaining that cannot be fairly sustained. The truth is, materialism has no more a necessary connection with infidelity, than the immaterialism "which just now clamors for the sanctions of the Bible, and the honor of the Christian name" has

[1]The writer of this article, the editor of the *Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*, though orthodox, of "the most straitest sect," tells a deal of truth by confining himself almost entirely to Scriptural language in his dealing with the subject. Immaterialism cannot exhibit its creed in the language of Scripture; and when confined to that for the expression of its sentiments covers itself with confusion, as it must assert, as in the above essay, the finite nature of sin, the mortality of man, the destruction of the ungodly, Satan a liar from the beginning, that God told the truth, and "the soul that sinneth, it shall die."—Ed.

[1]The Two-fold Nature of Man Psychologically considered. By W. R. Clark, D. D. Boston, 1870.

UMI

with paganism. It is time that this wretched cant about the immoral tendencies of materialism should be fairly put down by good fair men of whatever name or party. The first question that ought to be decided about any proposed doctrine is, Is it true? If it be *true*, its *tendencies* are all right. If it be *false*, its *tendencies* are all wrong. Our motto should be—"Let justice be done though the heavens fall." No man can afford to be brilliant at the expense of truth, or to achieve an apparent victory at the cost of justice. Many popular controvertists of the present day owe their temporary triumphs and ephemeral fame to the unscrupulous and dishonest, though confessedly brilliant manner, in which they have treated the subjects discussed.

It is our purpose in the present article to notice the principal points made by Dr. Clark, and to offer such observations thereon as the cause of truth and justice may seem to demand. His first point is "*man's personal identity*," upon which he remarks as follows:

IS THE SOUL A SEPARATE ENTITY?

"This is one of his indestructible idons, like those of personal existence, space, or duration. He can no more believe that he is not the same person to-day, that he was yesterday or last year, than that he does not exist in space."

"Further, he is shut up to this conviction by the *reductio ad absurdum*. It is an established fact that the body is constantly changing by waste and supply, so that within a few months, or years, at the the farthest, every particle of the former body passes away. If man is composed of nothing but a material body, then the totality of his former self passes away with this change; he is a new creature in such a sense that his present self can no more be responsible for the acts of his former self than for the acts of any other being."

"Suppose him arraigned at court for a crime committed seven years ago; he has only to adduce the change of identity effected by the entire displacement of the particles composing the body which committed the crime, to establish an *alibi*. The jury then must either acquit him, or deny the physiological facts adduced, or assume his duality."

"Again, this hypothetical change of identity requires that marriage be recontracted as often as the particles of the bodies which covenanted in the former ceremony are entirely displaced. And no parents can have lineal descendants over seven years of age; beyond that period the children bearing their names are theirs only by adoption, as might be any other little wanderers."

"But a graver difficulty is that which involves the Divine administration in injustice in bringing man to an account for *all*

the deeds done in the body, when the person so called to his account can only be the author of the deeds done in quite the last period of the probation."

This argument, so far as it has any bearing upon the question at all, makes as directly against the duality of man, as against his unity. Immaterialists define man to be "A being consisting of a rational soul and organic body. The constituent and *essential* parts of man created by God are two; body and soul."[1] If we accept this definition as "orthodox," then, since a subject cannot exist without all of its *essential* parts, we must believe that *man* cannot exist without a body, since that is declared to be an essential part of man. Now if Dr. Clark's once-in-seven-years-change theory be accepted as valid, then it necessarily follows that the man of twenty-eight is not the same man that he was at twenty-one; "he is a new creature in such a sense that his present self can no more be responsible for the acts of his former self than for the acts of any other being." This dilemma has induced some writers and speakers to claim that the soul was the real man, and that the body was no more a part of the man than the house was a part of the tenant. But Dr. Clark has precluded himself from taking refuge in this view by contending for the twofold nature of man. Should his own reasoning, therefore, be allowed, the *reductio ad absurdum* would apply equally well in his own case as in the one he has supposed.

IS THE MIND A SEPARATE ENTITY?

If a man were arraigned at court for a crime committed seven years before, it would only be necessary for him to plead that the criminal—the *man* who committed the crime—no longer existed. To prove this important assertion he might bring forward Dr. Clark's "physiological facts," and the orthodox definition which makes the body an essential part of the man. The jury would then be compelled to acquit him, or deny the "physiological facts adduced," or assume his unity.

Dr. Clark's theory would also reduce the usual marriage covenant to an absurdity, by invalidating it for a longer term than seven years. The rule as laid down by Paul is, that the woman "is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth." The question may seem strange and trifling, but let us ask, "Can a

[1] Buck's *Theological Dictionary*, *Art. Man.* Watson's *Institutes*. Part II. p. 326.

husband ever be more than seven years old? If the body be an essential part of the husband—as most people will readily allow to be the case—then according to this seven-year-change theory, a *husband* can *not* live more than seven years, because he has no existence longer than that. This absurdity would be hightened rather than lessened by alleging that immaterial and immortal souls are the contracting parties in marriage, for according to such a supposition the *soul* of man and not the *man* himself constitutes the husband, and since the woman "is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth," she would be bound to him forever, and be as much his wife in the world to come, as in this world.

Again, this hypothetical change of identity is incompatible with the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. For the question might well be asked in case of a plurality of bodies to the same soul, which body will be raised? Suppose a soul has lived in an embodied state seventy years, it has had according to the hypothesis, ten complete bodies, each of which has an equal claim to a resurrection. It is right here that Dr. Clark's theory explodes, and his illustrations of the *reductio ad absurdum* serve most admirably to exhibit the untenableness of his own positions.

Dr. Clark assures us that it is "established fact," "that within a few months, or years at furthest, every particle of the former body passes away." We should be glad to know when, how and by whom, this fanciful theory became converted into an "established fact." What eminent physiologist of this country or Europe has ever given it his sanction? It would be far more edifying to have our author's demonstration of the fact than his unsupported assertion of it. The presumption lies against any change in man's identity, and the *onus probandi*, therefore, belongs to him who disputes it. Dr. Clark has contented himself with simply making an assertion without attempting to prove it. We have therefore no argument to meet on this point, and will content ourselves with a few general observations.

It is a well known fact that great physical changes occur between infancy and manhood. It is equally evident that great mental changes take place in the same period. The identity of the body then is no less perfect than that of the mind. For the changes that take place in the mind between infancy and manhood are as indicative of a renovation of substance, as the changes in the body during the same period are presumptive of a change of corporeal particles. One gets a new mind as often as he gets a new body, and the mental identity changes as often as the physical. Whatever affects the whole body affects the mind; *and to this rule there are no exceptions.* The identity of the body then, must ever remain as perfect as that of the mind.

The process of waste and supply of bodily particles is so gradual that the organization retains its identity. The diseases of the body, its shapes and colors—whether natural as in complexion, or artificial as in tattooing, its scars, tumors, and other bodily affections remain unaltered by the change of corporeal particles. He would be the object of ridicule who should assert the necessity of vaccination once in seven years. If the diseases of the body and physical powers may be transferred to new particles, may not the mental powers also be transferred? We are as unconscious of the transfer of the one as of the other. A talented and ingenious writer thus accounts for the retention of physical identity:[1]

"It has been scientifically demonstrated that man is made up of a certain number of 'life cells,' which are the receivers of nourishment for the system, and are capable of *contraction* or *expansion;* thus man is sometimes lighter, and sometimes heavier, in proportion as the 'life cells' are replenished, or diminished. But where is the proof that there are additions or subtractions from the *number of 'life cells'*—which compose the physical identity of man—by the revolution of time? That there is a gradual passing off of substance received into the *life cells,* we admit, as they are receivers of nourishment, and are susceptible of contraction or expansion—can hold more or less nourishment, *receive* and *remit.*"

Upon the whole, we are forced to conclude that Dr. Clark in his first argument has entirely failed to sustain his theory of man's nature. Indeed, his argument has no force unless we admit that the mind is absolutely *unchangeable.* This we cannot do, for in a perfectly intelligible sense, the mind is the most *changeable* thing of which we have any knowledge. If the soul were unchangeable then the mind of the child should be as intelligent and vigorous as that of the man. On the contrary stubborn facts show that the mind like the body is weak in childhood, strong in middle-age, and weak in old age.

We have the authority of one of the greatest of modern philosophers for saying that great changes may occur in body and mind without destroying the identity of either. "In both cases," says

[1] William Sheldon, *Human Ghostology,* p. 20.

Thomas Brown—"the mental and physical—*and in both alike absolute identity* in the *strictest sense of the term* is consistent with *innumerable diversities.*"

INTUITIONS OF DUALITY.

II. Dr. Clark's second point is "*man's intuitions of his own duality.*" His application is thus made:

"Ask the most illiterate man if he believes that what in him thinks, loves, chooses, desires, resolves, is the same as his bones, and the earth on which he treads, and he will laugh you to scorn for seriously asking such a question."

And well he might, for a more foolish question could not well be framed. Nobody believes, nobody is ever asked to believe that the substance that secretes thought is "the same as his bones and the earth on which he treads." Such kind of talk is calculated to mislead the inquirer after truth, and is far more ingenious than ingenuous. Immediately after the above follows this assertion:

"You might as easily convince him that he walks on his head, or flies through the air, as that the pulp of his brain thinks."

Could you indeed! Undoubtedly the *more illiterate* the man, the better your chance of success. On such a question as this, however, we greatly prefer the testimony of such a man as Brown, or Tyndall, or Huxley, to that of "the most illiterate man." It is well known that many of the most distinguished physicists of France, Germany, England and America, maintain that the functions of the brain are to secrete thought. The incredulty of ignorant men will do little harm to the cause of truth, so long as the ablest and most enlightened philosophers give the subject of unbelief their warmest adhesion. I have no intuition that forbids me to believe that my brain is the organ of thought in the same sense that my lungs are the organs of respiration. Is it an intuition with Dr. Clark that his thinking is done by an *immaterial substance?* If so, well. But let him not claim that this intuition is universal. The maxim of Descartes, *cogito ergo sum*, "I think, therefore I am," was to him the embodiment of a truth essential to his belief in his own existence. Intuition recognizes this idea,—I think. Who or what is the *ego?* If the soul monopolises it, if the two expressions "soul" and "I" are synonomous, then is the duality dogma of man's nature disproved. If the *ego* or personality, inheres in or consists

of both soul and body, then is the fundamental doctrine of immaterialism overthrown at once. For, if when a man says "I think," he means that he as a dual compound being composed of soul and body thinks, then he asserts in the strongest manner possible his belief in the necessary agency of matter in the production of thought.

Intuition can only take cognizance of self-evident facts or propositions. The intervention of reason, the attempt to weigh ideas, or balance probabilities, is fatal at once to intuition. That we exist and that we exist in space are intuitions universally prevalent. But to assert that the brain has nothing do with the production of thought, and then to say that all except a few infidels, who form an "inconsiderable exception," have intuitively accepted this assertion as a self-evident truth is to *assert* what has never been proved, and to *say* that which is historically untrue. When I say—"The whole is greater than a part" my intuition affirms it at once, for it is a self-evident truth. But when I say—"The convex surface of a right pyramid is equal to the perimeter of its base multiplied by half the slant-height," my intuition does not approve the proposition, because it is not self-evident, but requires a demonstration. Precisely so when I assert that I live, my intuition affirms it at once. But when I assert that my brain has nothing to do with the production of thought, my intuition does not approve of the assertion. There are many things which are neither self-evident, nor susceptible of ordinary proof, which we nevertheless accept as true. For instance one may be unable to prove by intuition or otherwise that his liver secretes bile, yet he believes it, and it might be difficult to persuade him not to believe it. So the materialist has no intuition that his brain secretes thought, yet he believes it, and it may require something more than unsupported assertions to the contrary to make him disbelieve it.

The argument founded on man's intuitions, therefore, fails to prove his duality.

AN ASSUMED ABSURDITY.

III. "*The absurdity of assuming that the mere organization of matter should evolve attributes* which it did not originally possess. Materialists admit that only certain forms of organized matter can think and feel. The admission is fatal to their theory, involving it in the paradox of producing something from noth-

ing.' If they claim for matter organized properties not inherent in matter unorganized, it devolves on them to show *whence* those properties."

This argument is without force if for no other reason because it is founded upon a misstatement of facts. The claim of materialism is misstated. What they do claim is that certain forms and qualities of organized matter do evolve thought when vitalized by "the breath of life." It is only animalized matter that can think or feel. Matter only possesses those powers and properties with which God has endowed it. It is the living man himself that thinks by his brain and breathes by his lungs; and he does thus because God rendered him capable of it by giving him an organization fitted to discharge these functions. Dr. Clark seems to have anticipated some such talk as this, for he deprecates thus:

"To say that the Creator may have developed out of the human organism the attributes of mind, though the act of doing it is inconceivable, is both to beg the question, and aver an absurdity."

This is about as consistent as though I should argue thus in kind:

"To say that the Creator may have developed out of a rosebud the attribute of fragrance, though the act of doing it is inconceivable, is both to beg the question and aver an absurdity."

Again our author declares that "If mind is evolved from matter by organization, it is a phenomenon to be shown by the analysis of mind and matter; otherwise all proof from that source fails."

To which may be replied: If mind is pure spirit, in no way dependent upon matter for its existence or production, it is a phenomenon to be shown by an analysis of spirit and immaterial substances; otherwise all proof from that source fails. Besides we do not claim that "mind is evolved from matter by organization." We claim that mind is an attribute of animalized organization. Matter devoid of animal life, is, so far as we know, incapable of evolving thought.

THE TESTIMONY OF CONSCIOUSNESS.

IV. "The testimony of consciousness is four-fold. (1) It testifies to the antithesis of mind and matter, as clearly as it does to the antithesis of a moral virtue and a triangle. If matter, in

[1]Is the production of something from nothing a *paradox?*—that is a *seeming* untruth merely?

any of its forms, and mind are identical, they must be so in their qualities."

No sane person claims that mind and perceptible matter are identical. This would be as absurd as to claim that steam and sugar are identical. When one speaks of a "moral virtue" and a "triangle" the mind observes no antithesis, because they are incapable of contrast. We never speak of a contrast between a dog and a mountain, or a river and a tree, or a passion and a pony. We know nothing of the essence of matter, and the mind therefore can have no consciousness of it. It is idle therefore to say that consciousness testifies to the antithesis of mind and all forms or qualities of matter, since there can be no contrast between a thing perceivable and a thing unperceivable; between a thing known and a thing unknown. It is right here and in the application which he makes that Dr. Clark's argument limps badly.

"Consciousness," he says, "cognizes, for example, in mind the qualities of perception and passion; in matter, resistance and extension. If these qualities are identical, they are interchangeable; and we may speak of the perception and passion of matter, and of the resistance and extension of mind. Let one converse in this way, and he would be thought a fit subject for the lunatic asylum. But if the essential qualities of mind and matter are antithetical, their respective subjects are absolutely separate entities."

The contrast between the qualities of mind is as marked as the contrast between the qualities of mind and matter. (Properly speaking there is no contrast in either.) Hence we may reduce his position to this absurdity: The qualities of the mind, passion and perception, are not identical; therefore they are "antithetical." But if the essential qualities of the mind are "antithetical" their respective subjects are absolutely separate entities. Thus we should have the mind divided into as many entities as it had different qualities. For no two qualities, either of mind or matter, are identical, and we have just as good reason to suppose that the essential qualities of mind are therefore "antithetical," as we have to suppose that the essential qualities of mind and matter are antithetical.

This being admitted, it follows that consciousness cannot testify in a distinctive sense to the antithesis of mind and matter so as to prove them separate entities.

2. "Consciousness testifies to the presence of ideas in the mind which do not enter it through the senses. Ideas which

strike the consciousness from the senses, are all represented by the sensations, as the ideas of physical pain and pleasure. But how can ideas of the absolute, the infinite, space and duration which are infinite in extent, be represented by sensations which are finite? How can a tree cast the shadow of a mountain, or a rill echo the thunder of Niagara?"

Consciousness has no more a knowledge of the infinite than sensation has of the absolute. Dr. Webster defines consciousness to be "*the knowledge of sensations* and mental operations; or of what passes in one's own mind; the act of the mind which makes known *an internal object.*" Somebody has said that error cannot exist in the presence of a clear definition. Certain it is that a finite being can have no clear or definite notion of the infinite; and it is equally certain that consciousness, which Dr. Clark says "all the late and high authorities now agree in affirming to be coextensive with the perceptions," is unable from the very nature of the case to give any evidence respecting either the absolute or the infinite. This point, then, fails to establish the theory that there are ideas in the mind not derived from the senses.

3. "Consciousness testifies to being already in the mind, when the sensations enter it. I strike my body, and a sensation is produced. I am conscious of it because I feel it; if I did not feel it, there would be no sensation. There are, then, in this experience three things: (1) The sensation; (2) The cognition of it; (3) The subject which cognizes it. But the sensation is not the consciousness, for it is the object of cognition. The cognition is not the consciousness any more than the act of seeing is the eye. The subject which cognizes, then, must be logically antecedent to the thing cognized. If then, consciousness is logically antecedent to sensation, it does not originate in it, and is independent of it."

Consciousness and sensation are faculties that co-exist and are relatively inseparable. Sensation cannot exist without consciousness; and is it too much to say that the converse is also true? Who will say, or what is much better, who will *prove* that consciousness can exist without sensation? It must be granted that perception as a faculty cannot exist without sensation, for perception is the *knowledge* of external objects *consequent* on sensation. But the argument has proceeded thus far on the assumption that consciousness and perception are coextensive, and since perception is consequent on sensation, consciousness of external objects must also be consequent on sensation. It cannot, then,

be independent of it. In another place in answering an objection, Dr. Clark says:

"It is only by first knowing its own existence, that the soul can know that it has sensations. It knows it has physical pleasure and pain because it feels them; and it knows it feels them because there is a subject which feels, and which is not the feelings or sensations themselves. Chronologically, the consciousness may be coetaneous with the sensations; but logically, it must ever be antecedent to them."

"The sensations are an occasion of the soul's development; but it is aware of its own existence antecedent to the sensations, otherwise their presence could not be perceived. If perceived, there must be a perceiver, and the perceiving must be logically antecedent to the thing perceived."

In these extracts we have the issue plainly stated, and we are prepared to meet it. When Dr. Clark admits that chronologically, the consciousness may be coetaneous with the sensations, he virtually yields the very point for which he is contending. Consciousness of our sensations, and consciousness of our existence seem to be simultaneous. If, then, they are coetaneous, as a matter of fact, and mutually dependent on each other, consciousness cannot be used as a witness to testify to the presence of ideas in the mind *before* any sensation had ever entered it.

If sensations are perceived, it is said there must be a perceiver. True: but the perceiver is the living man himself and not an immaterial part of man. If the soul is an unchangeable entity, how can the sensations "*develop*" it? But if sensations required a physical organism, and they alone can develop a soul, will not a child's soul after death ever remain undeveloped? It is inconceivable that the mind should have a knowledge of its existence without the individual recognizing the fact. But no man ever remembers a thought, or is ever conscious of thinking at all when devoid of sensation. Dr. Clark in admitting that consciousness begins its existence *at the same time with sensation*, destroys the force of his assertion that "the soul is aware of its own existence *antecedent* to the sensations." For nothing could be more contradictory, than to assert that one of two faculties which begin their existence *at the same time*, is *antecedent* to the other in existence. We would like to have the proof, if it can be produced, that mind can exist in an active state without any of the senses, special or common; or, in other words,

UMI

that mind can exist as a separate entity. All immaterialists do not take the extreme position which Dr. Clark occupies. Thus Mr. Luther Lee frankly admits that "*the mind, in its present state, is dependent upon the* BODILY ORGANS *for primary ideas.*" This is undoubtedly the exact truth, though directly opposed to Dr. Clark's assertion that the mind has ideas before it has sensations.

Mr. John Wesley, in his sermon on "The Fall of Man," speaking of the body says:

"The soul cannot dispense with its service, imperfect as it is: for an embodied spirit *cannot form one thought, but by the mediation of its bodily organs. For thinking is not, as many suppose* [Dr. C. included], *the act of a pure spirit, but the act of a spirit connected with the body and playing upon a set of material keys.* It cannot possibly, therefore, make any better music, than the nature and state of its instruments allow it. Hence every disorder of the body, especially of the parts more immediately subservient to thinking, lay an almost insuperable bar in the way of its thinking justly."

If, as Mr. Wesley asserts, an embodied spirit *cannot form one thought* but by the meditation of its bodily organs; if as he says, "thinking is *not* the act of a pure spirit"—if the mind "cannot possibly make any better music than the nature and state of its instruments allow," is it reasonable to suppose that it can make any "music" at all without instruments of any kind, or that it can *think* without the mediation of any organs whatever? If thinking is not the act of a pure spirit, or of mind as a separate entity, we can understand the emphatic assertion of Scripture concerning the Son of man: "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; *in that very day his* THOUGHTS PERISH."

4. "Consciousness testifies to an original causative power in the mind, which cannot be predicated of the sensations. I am conscious of choosing, and of power not to choose—of willing, and of a power not to will. Not so with the sensations. If I cut my hand, the sensation of pain will continue, with no power to arrest it. I am conscious of feeling it, with the consciousness of not being able not to feel it. But when I act, it is with the consciousness of power not to act."

This is confounding the sensations as attributes with the subject of them as an individual. Sensation and consciousness are not entities, and it is idle to talk of them as such. It is true that while I am conscious of feeling pain, I am also conscious of

not being able not to feel it. It is true, also, that I am conscious of being conscious, but at the same time I am conscious of not being able not to be conscious. Where then is the original "causative power" of consciousness, which cannot be affirmed of the sensations? "When I act it is with the consciousness of power not to act." Very true; but this is the affirmation of an individual, not that of an attribute. We are quite willing to admit that consciousness testifies to a power possessed by the individual which cannot be predicated of the sensations. But consciousness gives not the slightest testimony in favor of the two-fold nature of man. It is impossible that it should do so from the very nature of the case.

APPEAL TO THE CREATOR.

V. "*The veracity of the Creator.* He alone is responsible for the validity of every belief which arises necessarily in the mind. I cannot avoid the belief that I exist in space. If this belief is not valid, my existence is a cheat. I have, for instance, a conscience which necessitates belief in the reality of moral distinctions. If those distinctions are a chimera, then he who has endowed me with the conscience whence that belief of necessity springs, is subjecting me to a life-long deception. In like manner does the veracity of God guarantee validity to the belief in the duality of man—an intuition of which the common mind cannot dispossess itself."

This argument is essentially the same as the one embraced in Dr. Clark's second point, and stands or falls with it—the argument based on man's intuitions of his own duality, which has already been reviewed.

If the belief in the duality of man is an intuition of which the mind cannot dispossess itself; if it is a belief which necessarily arises in the mind—we say *if* this is the case, then the argument for man's two-fold nature is a very strong one, perhaps unanswerable. But that little word "if" stands very much in the way of our acknowledging such a conclusion. We do not impeach the veracity of our Creator. Far from it, we say with Paul—"Let God be true and every man a liar." We choose the other alternative, and most emphatically deny the truthfulness of the assertion that a belief in man's two-fold nature "*is* an intuition of which the common mind cannot dispossess itself." We think it would be far more truthful to affirm this belief of man's

unity. But in either case assertions and denials prove nothing. Let us examine a little more carefully Dr. Clark's statements and see if they do not carry with them their own refutation. He argues that man's duality is a truth as self-evident as his own existence; and yet he writes an elaborate essay to *prove* (?) that which is self-evident, and which every man, *according to his argument*, knows already, and cannot help knowing? He who should write an essay to prove his own existence, or to establish the truth of the axiom that the whole is greater than a part, would be thought "a fit subject for a lunatic asylum." Were the duality of man an established fact universally recognized, we should never have had the privilege of reading Dr. Clark's essay.

THE PHENOMENA OF DEATH.

VI. "If the soul is a part of the body, is it not in the body at what is called death? If so, is the body dead? Ought it to be buried? Is not the person only asleep, and as truly liable to awake as one who sleeps for the night? If the soul is the result of organization, it must continue in it while the organization remains unimpaired. But at the instant of death, no change occurs in the organization of the body; there is simply a cessation of its functions. Anatomical examination finds every part perfect as before the breath left the body. A live coal placed upon a stone, parts with its calorie and changes its color, but not its organization. To assume a change of bodily organization because of the cessation of the bodily functions, when physiological facts do not show it, is to beg the question."

"If the soul remains in the body at death, where is it as in the case of the martyrs, whose bodies were burned, and scattered to the four quarters of the globe? If it is out of the body, is it not immaterial? If it is neither in the body nor out of it, is it not annihilated? And, therefore, is it not a false use of words to talk of the sleep of the soul at death? As well affirm the sleep of a soul before it begins to exist, as after it has ceased to exist."

Much of this proceeds upon the misapprehension of the materialist's position, and is therefore irrelevant and needs no other reply than this statement. We do not claim that the soul or mind is the result of organization merely, but that it is the result of organization vitalized by the breath of life. If we accept of Milton's definition that "man is a living being, intrinsically and properly one and individual, not compound or separable, not, according to the common opinion, made up and formed of two distinct and different natures, as of soul and body, but that the whole man is soul, and the soul man, that is to say, a body, or individual substance, animated, sensitive and rational," we must believe that death causes a live man to become a dead man, a living soul to become a dead soul. The question as to the disposition of separate entities is one that concerns only the immaterialist to answer. As to the future destiny of man, Revelation alone can give us any light.

If we turn to the sacred page containing the record of man's creation, *and bow to its authority*, we must become convinced of man's materiality and unity. "The Lord God formed *man* [not a part of him] of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and *man* became a living soul." Observe that the only element or thing added to the man formed of the dust, was not a soul, nor a mind, nor an entity of any kind, but simply "the breath of life" or power to live. In *him* we live, not in *ourselves*. Dr. Clark's theory would compel us to read the latter part of the passage thus—"and breathed into his nostrils a soul and man became a living soul and body."

Not less clearly do we find the unity and materiality of man's nature stated in the language of the sentence pronounced upon Adam after his transgression. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for *dust thou art*, and *unto dust shalt thou return*." Here, if ever it would seem man's double nature would have been recognized. Instead of this we have the inspired definition "*dust thou art*," which ought to absolutely settle the question forever. Observe, too, that as the Lord was addressing an intelligent being, he thereby plainly taught the doctrine that animalized matter was capable of manifesting intelligence by the evolution of thought. The only way that this conclusion can be avoided is, by supposing that the Lord addressed only an unintelligent body, and denounced against it the punishment of death as the penalty for the act of another entity, the soul, whose very existence he had all along entirely ignored. Let him who will embrace such a manifest absurdity. We believe that the Judge of all the earth did right, and that he by no means cleared the guilty.

When we speak to a person calling him by name, or when we address him by the use of a personal pronoun as *you* or *thou*, we

ally and properly one and individual, not compound or separa-

address him by the use of a personal pronoun as *you* or *thou*, we

UMI

invariably include in these designations the whole man as an intelligent individual. *This rule is universal and has no exceptions.* In the sentence against Adam the personal pronoun "thou" is five times used to designate him as an *intelligent being or entity.* As such he sinned; and as such *he died.* Nor can this conclusion be fairly avoided.

Dr. Clark asks—"Is it not a false use of words to talk of the sleep of the soul at death?" We think rather "a false use of words" occurs when persons holding his theory talk of the sleep of the body at death. Abp. Whately in his Fourth Lecture on a Future State says: "I have heard it said that the sacred writers in this employment of the word 'sleep,' and also the authors of our burial service who adopted it from them, meant the sleep of the body; but *I never could learn what is meant by that expression, 'sleep of the body;' for the words convey to me no distinct sense.*" That the Scriptures teach the "*sleep of the dead*," no one, probably, will deny. The only question to settle is, What are we to understand by the expression "the dead?" Immaterialists say it means "the body." We say it means the *man*—when applied to an individual human being. The inspired writers use the word sleep in such a manner that to apply it to the *body* and not to the *man* would be to deprive their language of all congruous significance. The *personality*—call it the soul if you will—is plainly included in such expressions as, "*I* shall *sleep* in the dust;" "Lest *I sleep the sleep of death;*" "*I* shall be satisfied when *I awake;*" "I will raise *him* up at the last day;" "Many of *them* that *sleep* in the dust of the earth shall *awake;*" "Awake and sing *ye* that dwell in dust." If it be the "*body*" in a distinctive sense as a separate entity, that alone goes down to the grave, why are we told that "the grave [that is, those who are in the grave] cannot praise the Lord?" Why call the grave "the land of forgetfulness," if there be nothing in it that ever remembered? Jesus said to his disciples: "Our friend *Lazarus sleepeth;* but I go that I may *wake him out of his sleep.*" And when they misapprehended his meaning, "then said Jesus unto them plainly, *Lazarus is dead.*" Many other illustrations might be given of the use that the inspired writers make of the word "sleep" when descriptive of the state of the dead, but enough have been given to conclusively show that it is a term to denote the repose of the whole man in death.

VARIOUS OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

VI. After closing his affirmative argument as embraced in the six points already noticed, Dr. Clark proceeds to answer "objections" to his theory. Many of these are exceedingly trivial and unworthy of serious consideration. We think that in several instances Dr. Clark has shown considerable skill in knocking down men of straw that he himself first set up, since the "objections" seem to be as much his composition as are the answers thereto.

As a specimen of these "men of straw," we give Nos. 2 and 3, with the answers attached:

2. "*If there be a soul in man distinct from the body, define it.* This is easily done. The soul is indivisible, imponderable; it exists in time and space, and possesses conative, emotional, and cognitive powers. Can body be any more clearly defined than soul?"

3. "*If no one has seen the soul, it is presumption to say that it exists.* If 'no man has seen God at any time,' is it presumption to say that he exists?"

There are but three "objections" in his list of twelve that seem worthy of our consideration as such. These and his treatment of them we will notice:

1. "*If man has an immaterial soul, where did he get it? If immediately from God, God is the author of his innate depravity. If from the parent, the parent's soul is divisible.*"

Ans. "The soul comes from God in no other sense than does the body. Both are the result of God's established economy. If the depravity is alleged, the difficulty is not avoided by shifting depravity from the soul to the body, since both alike spring from an economy of which God is the author."

"But the presumption is that the soul with the body proceeds from the parent. The only objection urged against this is, that it is a contradiction, since the soul is defined to be indivisible. Yet is not God indivisible? And is it therefore a contradiction to say that our first parents came immediately from him?"

Here for once the issue is plainly stated. Dr. Clark favors the doctrine of the soul's descent as opposed to its immediate creation. In this we are entirely agreed. It only remains to be seen whether the doctrine of traduction is compatible with the indivisibility of the soul. There is no contradiction in saying that God is indivisible and the Creator of our first parents. For we do not assert that they were a part of himself. On the contrary we have authority for declaring that they were formed out of

pre-existent matter. Dr. Clark's analogy, therefore, fails, since creation and procreation are two very different things. Jesus said to Nicodemus: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." Nothing could be more conclusive than these words, which are so plain and direct that even Richard Watson says they "certainly refer to the soul as well as to the body." Can something proceed from something without diminishing that from which it proceeds? Can a soul procreate its kind without being divisible? Can the soul create an entity without dividing itself? Dr. Clark says yes, and tells us how it can be done.

"If a single instance can be adduced of the creation of an entity by a soul, then the contradiction charged upon the presumption that the soul creates without dividing itself, vanishes. Now if I throw a ball, it will go on forever, if it meet with no resistance. Why? Because it possesses a certain quantum of force, which I have imparted to it. Yet my force is not diminished by what I have imparted to the ball. Have I not, then, created an entity, without dividing myself? But if I have created one entity without dividing myself, I may another, for aught that appears in the nature of the case. Thus does this alleged contradiction vanish like a bubble at the touch, leaving the presumption in favor of the procreation of the soul. Where is there proof to the contrary?"

In the above paragraph several points invite our attention. (1) The thing to be illustrated, viz.: The creation of an entity by a soul without dividing itself.

(2) The illustration—a man throwing a ball.

(3) The assertion that a man may part with a certain quantum of force without diminishing the force with which he had been previously endowed.

Let us briefly notice these in order.

I. In stating the thing to be illustrated, and the illustration itself, Dr. Clark refutes his own theory of man's two-fold nature. The subject to be illustrated is the creation of an entity by a soul. Now by a "soul," Dr. Clark would have us understand an immaterial substance, an entity distinct and separate from the body, yet forming an essential part of the man. He thus attempts to illustrate how a mind or soul can create an entity. (2) "*I* throw a ball." Thus *I* create an entity. In the proposition, the actor was a separate entity—the soul. In the demonstration the actor is a human being consisting of *two* entities—body and soul. Here then is a clear case of *non sequitur*. The actor in the demonstration must be the same as in the proposition, else

there can be no logical conclusion. But then it would be palpably absurd to speak of the mind or soul as an immaterial entity throwing a ball. When I throw a ball it is physical force that gives it motion. When Dr. Clark speaks of the act to be performed, he ignores the duality of man's nature by speaking of him as a unit. But he says throwing a ball is the creation of an entity. Why should a ball in motion be considered an entity more than a ball at rest? Besides he claims to have *created* an *entity* by merely imparting motion to a lifeless ball. If a ball thrown by a man be an entity, then a ball projected from a cannon by the force of gunpowder would also be an entity. Or if *perpetual* motion be considered essential to make entities of this class, then the earth, sun, moon and stars are entities.

Dr. Webster defines an *entity* to be, "1. Being; essence; existence; 2. A real being or species of being." How absurd to say when a man throws a ball that he *creates a real being or essence!* A child is an entity, but a ball is not. Besides what is too obvious to escape notice is, that the illustration is completely neutralized by basing it upon the most improbable contingency. *If* I throw a ball, it will go on forever, *if* it meet with no resistance. Again the important fact should not be lost sight of that the proposition necessary to be proved or illustrated is, that the human soul is capable of creating an *entity of its own kind* without dividing itself. Our essayist says—"If I have created one entity without dividing myself, I may another, for aught that appears in the nature of the case." Certainly; but it would not follow because you had created a ball-entity without dividing yourself, that you could create a soul-entity and still possess an indivisible soul.

(3). The assertion that a man can impart force without losing any, carries with it its own refutation.

The objection, then, so far as Dr. Clark's reasoning affects it, remains good.

II. "*If the soul does not depend upon organized matter for its attributes, why should it ever be unconscious of its own being.*" "If it is intended to affirm that the suspension of the senses causes a suspension of the consciousness, the affirmation is denied, and the burden of proof falls upon him who makes it. . . . The evidence is strong that the consciousness is never suspended."

The proofs that consciousness is often suspended are abundant and conclusive. We can confidently appeal to universal experience. There is not a single instance in the recorded his-

tory of mankind, where any man ever passed the whole of his life in a state of unbroken consciousness. We have strong proof in the testimony of consciousness itself. Of course we cannot say that we are ever conscious of being unconscious; but every man *can* say that *he is not conscious of having been conscious* all the time. "I am not conscious that I was conscious at twelve o'clock last night, neither do I remember that I was conscious at that time." Millions of people could subscribe to such testimony, every day in the year. What stronger proof is needed? He who has slept soundly, will upon awaking testify that the time thus spent in sleep is to him a blank; that so far as he knew he had not had a thought during the time. It would be a contradiction of terms to say that a man could be conscious without knowing it.

Other instances, however, are not wanting, in which the proofs of the suspension of consciousness are, if possible, still stronger than those afforded by natural sleep.

"It will often happen," says Abp. Whately, "when any one sleeps very soundly, that the moment of his awaking shall appear to him immediately to succeed that of falling asleep; although the interval may have been many hours. Something of the same kind has been observed in a few instances of madness, and in apoplexy; in which all the ordinary operations of the mind having been completely suspended for several years, the patients, on recovery of their senses, have been found *totally unconscious* of the whole interval, and distinctly remembering and speaking of, as having happened the day before, events which occurred before the seizure; so that they could hardly be brought to believe that whole years had since elapsed."[1]

A stunning blow on the head renders the person as unconscious as the weapon with which the blow was struck. Thousands of persons can testify from experience to the truth of this statement; yet according to the doctrine of immaterialism, a still more dreadful blow, one which should crush the skull and scatter the brains, would cause the mind to become more active and vigorous than it had ever been before.

There are many well authenticated instances of the total suspension of consciousness caused by the brain being injured. A sailor fell from the yard-arm of a vessel, and when he was picked up, was found to be insensible. "For a period of thirteen months and some days," says Sir Astley Cooper, "*his mind had remain-*

[1] *Scripture Revelations of a Future State*, Lect. III.

ed in a state of perfect oblivion: he had drank, as it were, the cup of Lethe; he had suffered a COMPLETE DEATH, as far as regarded his *mental*, and almost all of his bodily powers; but by removing a small portion of bone with a saw, he was at once restored to all the functions of his mind, and almost all the powers of his body."

It is well known that chloroform and other anæsthetic agents may be used to render one insensible and unconscious without destroying life. In such instances is not consciousness suspended? Modern immaterialists have deemed it necessary to insist upon the ceaseless consciousness of the mind or soul. Thus Mr. Luther Lee says: "*With us, to cease to think is to cease to be a soul.*" Again he speaks of the soul as a being, "whose very *existence is thought*, which is never known to exist only in connection with thought, and is *known to exist only* FROM *its thoughts.*"[1] Here the very existence of the soul is made to depend upon its being perpetually conscious. Such theorists as Mr. Lee teach the natural immortality of the soul, and therefore reject all proofs of its ever being unconscious. A doctrine that *compels* its advocates to act thus had better be abandoned at once.

The older immaterialists were more cautious if not more consistent. Mr. Richard Watson in his *Theological Institutes*, says it cannot be proved that consciousness is an essential attribute of spirit, and affirms that the natural immortality of the soul is contradicted by Scripture.[2]

Speaking of the *existence* of the mental powers when inactive, the author of the *Analogy of Religion* says:

"Sleep, or however a swoon, shows not only that these powers exist when they are not exercised, as the passive power of motion does in inanimate matter; but shows also that they exist when there is *no present capacity of exercising them*; or that the *capacities of exercising them for the present*, as well as the actual exercise of them, *may be suspended*, and yet the powers themselves remain undestroyed."

If the mind were a separate entity, not dependent in any degree upon the body for its activity, but immortal in its own nature, no kind of bodily affection, or injury—such as sleep, a swoon, or a broken skull, would retard its action in the least. A slight pressure upon the brain would not suspend its consciousness; it would never require rest, nor could it ever be diseased.

[1] *True Wesleyan*, Aug. 10, 1849. [2] Part II., p. 388.

Facts, stubborn and indisputable, compel us to believe, therefore, that the mind is not a separate entity, and independent of the physical organism, but that animalized matter is the cause and mind the necessary result. The objection then remains in full force—*If the soul does not depend upon organized matter for its attributes, it should never be unconscious of its own being.*

III. *A second childhood is obtained in old age.* Ans. "Not only is there one instance in which the vigor of the mind is not affected by the decay of the body, the instances are so universal that their converse is the rare exception. The greatest intellectual vigor of which history boasts, has been developed after the body had become decrepit with age and disease. This no one will deny; and it at once and forever enthrones mind over physical law, and establishes its immortality."

Dr. Clark's answer to the second objection consists mainly of hardy denial of every-day facts; his answer to the third consists in bold and reckless affirmations which are unsupported by either testimony, reason or authority. We might content ourselves with merely denying each and every allegation contained in Dr. Clark's answer, but since he has chosen to peril his theory upon their truthfulness, and to base thereon his belief in the mind's immortality, it may be well to show affirmatively that no one of them is founded upon fact.

We not only deny that "the greatest intellectual vigor of which history boasts has been developed after the body had become decrepit with age and disease," but we are prepared to show by an appeal to history and "the common consent of mankind," that the assertion is not true. It may be a matter of dispute in what profession the greatest intellectual vigor of which history boasts has been developed; whether in war or in philosophy; in science or in statesmanship; in law or in divinity; in medicine or in literature. We will therefore notice the record of a few in each class whose names stand highest on the roll of fame. Of eminent soldiers we have this record: Alexander the Great won the battle of Arbela at twenty-five, and was conqueror of the world at thirty-two. At twenty-five Hannibal was commander-in-chief of the Carthaginian armies, and at thirty-one he gained his greatest victory at Cannæ. At thirty-two Scipio Africanus won the decisive battle of Zama, which led to the downfall of Carthage. Julius Cæsar was consul at twenty-nine, conqueror of Gaul at forty-six, crossed the Rubicon at fifty, and won the battle of Pharsalia at fifty-two; and Wellington was hardly forty-seven when he gained the decisive victory of Waterloo. Marlborough was fifty-four at Blenheim, but for several years before his death at the age of seventy-two, his faculties had become so impaired by age and toil that he took very little part in public affairs. Frederick the Great at thirty-three was acknowledged as the greatest soldier of his time. He successfully closed the Seven Year's War, and baffled all his enemies at fifty. Arthurty-one Bonaparte was triumphant in Italy, and at thirty-seven had gained his greatest victories at Austerlitz and Jena.

These are the greatest names of which military "history boasts," yet none of them became great after their possessors had "become decrepit with age and disease." We must look elsewhere than to the profession of arms to find an instance of the kind mentioned by Dr. Clark.

Among eminent philosophers, Aristotle was forty-three when he was appointed tutor of Alexander the Great, and at fifty had founded a new school of philosophy. Sir Francis Bacon published his great work the *Novum Organon* at fifty-nine. Sir Isaac Newton at forty had made his three great discoveries of Fluxions, the nature of light and color, and the laws of gravitation. His *Principia* was published before its author was forty-five. John Locke began his *Essay on the Human Understanding* at fifty, and published it at fifty-eight. Immanuel Kant published his *Critical Philosophy* at fifty-seven. He died at the age of eighty, having been for some years weak in body and imbecile in mind. Spinoza published his principal work at thirty-eight, and died at forty-five. Thomas Brown, the author of *Lectures on the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, died at the age of forty-three. Descartes died at fifty-four, and Hume completed his *Treatise on Human Nature* at thirty-six. Among eminent philosophers we shall look in vain to find a single instance where the greatest intellectual vigor was developed after the body had become decrepit with age and disease.

It would be equally vain to look for such an instance in the history of men eminent for scientific attainments. Copernicus completed his astronomical labors by the reform of the Ptolemaic system at fifty-seven, and died at seventy. Tycho Brahe, who has been called the restorer of astronomy, became celebrated by the discovery of a new star at twenty-six, and died at fifty-five. Kepler, who discovered the ellipticity of the planets, and the

laws which regulate their movements, died at fifty-nine; and Herschell discovered the *Georgium Sidus* at forty-three. Galileo, at the age of twenty, was professor at Pisa, and at forty-five constructed a telescope with which he made those great discoveries which convinced him of the truth of the Copernican system. "Franklin tamed the lightning" at forty-eight; and "Morse taught it the English alphabet" at forty-four.

The lives of great statesmen, lawyers and orators show most conclusively that their greatest intellectual powers were attained before old age and disease had made them physically weak.

Demosthenes prepared his celebrated oration against Midias at thirty-seven; his masterly oration on the crown at forty-two, and died at fifty-nine. Cicero was a successful advocate at thirty, and gained the title of Father of his country by frustrating Catiline's conspiracy, at the age of forty-three. Richard Brinsley Sheridan attained his greatest eminence as an orator before he was forty-five; and Edmund Burke, who wrote his essay on the Sublime and Beautiful, at thirty-five was leading manager in the impeachment of Hastings, and achieved his greatest success as an orator at fifty-six. William Pitt, the younger, whose eloquence rivaled the most illustrious of ancient orators, died at forty-seven. Charles James Fox, one of the most distinguished of statesmen and orators, was Secretary of State at thirty-five, and died at fifty-eight.

Among doctors of divinity and medicine who attained the highest eminence in their respective professions may be mentioned Martin Luther, who wrote his theses against the sale of papal indulgences, at thirty-four; attended the Diet of Worms at thirty-seven, and established the Reformation in Germany before he was fifty; John Calvin, who published his *Institutes* at forty-five, and attained almost absolute power in Geneva at fifty; William Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood at thirty-eight; and Edward Jenner discovered the utility of vaccination as a preventive of small-pox, at twenty-seven.

In the fertile field of literature we are unable to find a single instance in which the greatest intellectual vigor was developed after the body had become decrepit with age and disease. John Milton, one of the greatest of all poets and scholars, wrote his *Hymn on the Nativity*, which is, perhaps, the finest lyric in the English language, at twenty-one, and reached the hight of fame at fifty-seven by completing his greatest poem—*Paradise Lost*. Alexander Pope translated the *Iliad* at thirty-two, and published his *Essay on Man* at forty-five. At thirty-three Thomas Gray gave to the world the finest elegy ever written, and one which will ever remain one of the most popular of all poems. Virgil died at fifty-one; Dante at fifty-six; Shakspeare at fifty-two, and Byron at thirty-seven. Hume completed his *History of England* at fifty; and the great Samuel Johnson published the *Variety of Human Wishes* at forty, a *Dictionary of the English Language* at forty-six, and *Rasselas* at fifty.

This list might be extended much farther, but since it already contains the names of the most eminent soldiers, philosophers, writers, and scholars of which history boasts, it is sufficient to establish the fact that the greatest intellectual vigor has *not* been developed after the body had become decrepit with age and disease. Dr. Clark would confer a great favor by publishing to the world a list of eminent men who had *developed* their greatest intellectual powers *after they had become decrepit with age and disease.* A very short list would answer; even a single instance of the kind would be entitled to a place in the *History of Miracles.*

That there are rare instances where the body has become weakened by age and disease, in which the mind retains much of its former vigor, no one will deny. But these instances prove nothing. In many cases the body just before death from disease shows wonderful strength, but this does not prove its immortality. Neither do occasional instances of mental activity in old age or at the approach of death prove the immortality of the mind. If immaterialism were true, *then in every case* the mind should exhibit increased vigor, exactly in proportion as the body grows weak by the infirmities of age or the wasting of disease. If matter is a clog on the mind, and a hindrance to its activities; if the body serves as a prison to the soul, then, indeed, one might reasonably expect that the mind at the approach of old age or death, would be encouraged to such an extent at the prospect of a liberation from its tenement of clay, that it would evince its joy in the most vigorous manner. But how contrary is this to all experience! In a vast majority of cases the mind appears to decay with the body; but if immaterialism were *true, this* should *never* be the case. If death be that event which sets the prisoner free; if while

> "Life makes the soul dependent on the dust,
> Death gives her wings to mount above the spheres,"

then is life wretched, and death joyful; then is life to be deplored as a curse, and death to be welcomed as a blessing.

But it is *not* true. The assertion that the body is a clog on the mind is as wicked as it is false. If mind be a separate substance and superior to the body, why did the Creator join them thus closely together? Surely no good motive can be assigned, and who will dare charge him with an evil one? He who asserts that matter is a hindrance to mind, and that their union is inharmonious and depressing to the soul, *virtually* charges his Creator with weakness and lack of wisdom in the work of creation. What can mind do without the aid of matter? Can it see, hear, feel, taste or smell? Can it make a plow or a pen, or use either when already made? Further than this, can mind alone, and disconnected from matter, perform any intellectual act, think, reason, weigh evidence, solve a problem, or demonstrate any truth whatsoever? If it ever has done any of these things, where is the evidence which proves it? It is true we are *told* that the mind is capable of performing wonders without the aid of matter, but the naked assertion is all that we have. We are told and asked to believe that the mind is ever conscious and unwearied; that its powers will be greatly augmented when it becomes disembodied at death; that then as an immaterial entity it will outstrip the light in swiftness and explore the universe —all these things and many more are *told* us, but they are *only told*; they are not *proved*. No man can safely limit the capabilities of matter. So far as any one can prove to the contrary the essence of matter and spirit may be the same. We know nothing of the absolute nature of matter, and but little of its capacities. Everything that we see, or feel, or taste, or smell, is matter. All philosophers and inventors have owed to matter the means that have insured their success. The navigator in material ship sails on a material ocean, and circumnavigates a material globe. The chemist analyzes matter by matter; and the mechanic uses material tools on material substances to form material products. The astronomer standing on a material earth, looks with material eyes through a material glass at the material heavens. Electricity, galvanism, heat and light, confessedly properties of matter, are invisible and imponderable, yet are they among the most important forces in nature. It would be wiser to first find out all that matter *can* do before we dogmatically assert what it *cannot* do.

Nothing is more common than to hear old people complain of failing memory and loss of mental power. Oliver Wendell Holmes, in a recent address at Harvard College, said:

"The problem of memory is closely connected with the question of the mechanical relation between thought and structure. How intimate is the alliance of memory with the material condition of the brain, is shown by the effect *of age*, of *disease*, of a blow, of intoxication. I have known an aged person repeat the same question five, six or seven times during the same brief visit."

Very appropriate in this connection are the words of the Duke of Argyll:

"If the blood ceases to circulate, or the chest to heave, in an instant all our thoughts perish. Prolonged intellectual exercise produces bodily exhaustion, *showing that mind and body are inseparably connected.* Every physician knows that from a change in the substance and structure of the brain, the pure may become impure; the loving malignant; the thoughtful imbecile; or *the whole man may live for years without consciousness and without* emotion. No series of facts can be more complete or more conclusive than that which tends to establish the truth that the brain —a compound of water, fat, albumen, and phosphates—generates thought."

How strong is the contrast between this testimony and that of Dr. Clark, who would have us believe that the instances in which the vigor of the mind is not affected by the decay of the body are so universal that their converse is the rare exception. When one argues thus recklessly against the common experience of mankind he must be wrong.

Dr. Clark's assertions, however absurd they may appear, are but consistent with the theory which he advocates. No man can defend immaterialism better than he has done it in his essay. That he has failed to make it appear reasonable or consistent is owing not to his want of ability, but to the indefensible nature of the doctrine itself. The double substance theory of human nature is incompatible with the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and its punishment or reward in the world to come. For if the soul or mind is a separate entity and the only intelligent part of man, that, and that alone is the rewardable subject. The body, if essentially unintelligent, is not a responsible agent, and, therefore, not a rewardable subject. But the Scriptures plainly teach the resurrection of the body and represent it as a

rewardable subject. Therefore the doctrine that man consists of two entities, soul and body, or mind and matter, is untrue.

J. H. W.

THE BURIAL OF MOSES.

"And he buried him in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor; but no man knoweth of his sepulcher unto this day. (Deut. 34: 6.)

By Nebo's lonely mountain,
On this side Jordan's wave,
In a vale in the land of Moab,
There lies a lonely grave;
And no man knows that sepulcher,
And no man saw it e'er,
For the angel of God upturned the sod,
And laid the dead man there.

There was the grandest funeral
That ever passed on earth,
And no man heard the trampling,
Or saw the train go forth,
Noiselessly as the daylight
Comes back when night is done,
And the crimson streak on ocean's cheek
Grows into the great sun;

Noiselessly as the spring-time,
Her crown of verdure weaves,
And all the trees on all the hills
Open their thousand leaves—
So, without sound of music,
Or voice of them that wept,
Silently down from the mountain's crown
The great procession swept.

Perchance the bald old eagle
On gray Beth-peor's hight,
Out of his lonely eyrie,
Looked on the wondrous sight;
Perchance the lion stalking,
Still shuns that hallowed spot,
For beast and bird have seen and heard
That which man knoweth not.

But when the warrior dieth,
His comrades in the war,
With arms reversed and muffled drum,
Follow his funeral-car:
They show the banners taken,
They tell his battles won,

And after him lead his masterless steed,
While peals the minute gun.

Amid the noblest of the land
We lay the sage to rest,
And give the bard an honored place,
With costly marble drest,
In the great minister transept,
Where lights like glories fall,
And the organ rings and the sweet choir sings,
Along the emblazoned wall.

This was the truest warrior
That ever buckled sword;
This the most gifted poet
That ever breathed a word;
And never earth's philosopher
Traced with his golden pen
On the deathless page truths half so sage
As he wrote down for men.

And had he not high honor—
The hillside for a pall,
To lie in state, while angels wait
With stars for tapers tall,
And the dark rock pines, like tossing plumes,
Over his bier to wave,
And God's own hand in that lonely land
To lay him in the grave?

In that strange grave,
Whence his uncoffined clay
Shall break again, O wondrous thought,
Before that judgment day,
And stand with glory wrapped around
On the hills he never trod,
And speak of the strife that won our life,
With the Incarnate son of God!

O! lonely grave in Moab's land!
O! dark Beth-peor's hill!
Speak to these curious hearts of ours,
And teach them to be still.
God hath his mysteries of grace,
Ways that we cannot tell;
He hides them deep, like the hidden sleep
Of him he loved so well.

—*Dublin University Magazine.*

THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE LIFE.[1]

We approach a great subject; let us do it with becoming reverence; with a profound regard to the teaching of the divine word, whence alone we derive information on matters supernatural and future; and with the utmost charity for many Christian men who feel it their duty to hold and teach doctrines which we feel it our duty to reject and oppose. We do not enter a battle-field for victory; but at the imperial call of conscience, we give a reason of the hope that is in us, and wish to do it in the spirit of meekness which our holy faith requires. If the conclusions we have reached are wrong, we at least demand belief when we say that they have been reached after patient, thoughtful, and honest investigation, with a fervent desire to know the truth and a settled purpose to follow it, whether it lead to honor or dishonor, approbation or censure. Never without a deep sense of duty to God and men we would have dared to ruffle the smooth river of popular theology, which is flowing and has flowed for ages in one direction. And if it seems a bold thing to question interpretations which all Christendom has stereotyped, let it be distinctly understood that personal conviction is too sacred to be silenced though a world were against it; that majorities are not the test of divine truth; and that, after all, interpretations are only human things, and may therefore be questioned without committing a very serious offence against the courtesy due to learning and piety. Nor do we mean to introduce counter interpretations, but to let the Holy Book speak for itself, taking the words in their primary and proper meaning, and accepting what is written as our sole authority in matters of religious belief. Surely thoughtful men should hear us with candor, when we affirm with all sincerity that our sole object is the restoration of apostolic doctrine on several subjects of profound and far-reaching importance; and even if we utterly fail, the excellence of the motive ought to secure the respect of the intelligent and the devout.

That the "Scripture of truth" reveals a future life; that it teaches and dwells largely upon the sublime and wonderful doc-

[1] This Lecture was delivered in the Mansion House, Hackney, by the Editor of the *Rainbow* on Tuesday evening, November 1, 1870.

trine of resurrection from the dead; and that the idea of immortality, or deathlessness, has presented itself to the mind of mankind in every part of the civilized world, are facts beyond dispute. These things, as such, come not within the range of controversy. The controversy which has set in, and for which we devoutly thank the Lord God of truth, does not relate to these facts, but to the persons who are to exist in the revealed future life, and to the question whether the common idea of immortality is warranted either by the nature of man or the word of God.

To these points your thoughtful attention is requested, for it is impossible to exaggerate their importance, or the influence which they have on the entire system of revealed truth. Every Christian man should be supremely solicitous for the honor of his heavenly Father, and the reception of doctrine as divine, for which *he* has given no authority by prophet or apostle, or the great Lord of both, will dim the lustre of doctrines which he has made known, and vitiate our conceptions of much that is priceless precious in the Holy Book. All Scripture truth is related. It is a symmetrical, compact, harmonious whole; a marvellous temple, suggested by infinite love, planned by infinite wisdom, radiant with infinite light. The longer we look upon it, the more our admiration is excited, and the deeper becomes our sorrow if we see here and there on pillar, architrave, or wall, any dark spot so totally out of harmony with the brilliance and beauty of the edifice that we are morally certain it was not left there by the glorious Builder. Be it distinctly understood, however, that it is only by the light of the temple itself that we see such a spot. We do not ask reason what *should be*; we ask revelation what *is*. Our preconceptions must stand aside; we must be guided entirely by the evidence; we desire to listen with reverence to the voice which speaks from heaven, remembering who it is that says to each of us, "How readest thou?"

I. The Scripture reveals a future life. "Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner," writes Paul to Timothy; "but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel according to the power of God, who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who

UMI

hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." These words made the *fact* of a future life as clear as possible. Whatever its source and nature, or whoever its subjects may be—questions to be answered presently—there is the bright truth itself, without controversy; our Savior Jesus Christ has appeared, our Savior Jesus Christ has brought life and immortality to light. He is "*the Life*," and came to "give life." Both parts of this brief sentence are from his own lips. Of those who hear his voice and follow him, he says this glorious thing: "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand."

The doctrine that men by nature are immortal, or have immortal or never-dying souls, is believed by almost all Christendom. It is taught in pulpits, sung in hymns, enforced in homilies, elaborated in books, and appealed to by home and foreign missionaries as an urgent reason why men should accept the gospel salvation, and thus escape an "eternity of woe." The dignity of man as an immortal is the grand theme of many an eloquent oration over the coffin of the dead; and millions of religious tracts embodying the notion are scattered over the face of the earth by zealous Christian people, who are anxious to do good in their day and generation; and yet—will you believe it?—it is *not* true. There is not an atom of truth in it. There is not even the shadow of a shade of support for it in the Holy Scriptures. It is simply a world-wide delusion perpetuated by its author, the father of lies, who first uttered it in the garden of Eden, when, daring to contradict Jehovah, he said to the woman, "Ye shall not surely die." But it was expressly that he might not eat of the tree of life and live forever, that God after Adam's disobedience sent him forth from the garden of Eden. The gracious Creator would not have such a monster in his universe as a deathless sinner. It is only God himself who can use the majestic language: "I lift up my hand to heaven and say, I live forever." Man, as such, is not and cannot be immortal. The whole Bible is a protest against this arrogant assumption, by a sin-corrupted mortal, of one of the glorious attributes of God, "who only hath immortality." Every variety of similitude is taken from the feeblest and most perishable things with which we are acquainted, to show what man is. He is anything but immortal in the eyes of the writers who wrote under the direction of God's Holy Spirit; and as guides in this region of thought, we prefer them to all the philosophers of pagan antiquity and all the schoolmen of the middle ages. Nay, be assured of this one thing, that so far is immortality from being an attribute of man, the thing is impossible to any human creature except as the gift of God through Jesus Christ, and even then it is not a gift securing an individual independent existence through the coming ages, but one entirely dependent on the *life of Christ in the man*. Even the redeemed have not an immortality of their own apart from the Redeemer; they are the body of which Christ is the Head and the Life, and it is *this* that secures perpetuity of being to them. "Because I live," he says to his followers, "ye shall live also." This is, in fact, the condensed message of the entire gospel—life in Christ alone—perfect holiness being the absolutely indispensable condition of perpetuated being. Without holiness no man shall see the Lord, and this moral purity is to be had only by union with the Holy One of God. It is not only inferable from a comprehensive view of revealed truth, that a time is coming when there shall be neither sin nor sorrow in the universe of God, but we have the sublime assurance in so many words. It is obvious, therefore, that the unholy can have no existence, and no possible place of existence in that perfect and blessed universe.

What, then, is the future of the unsaved, that is to say, of men who have had the offer of life in Christ and have *refused* it? for to such only can the moral considerations of the dispensation of grace apply. The responsibilities of manifested light cannot rest upon the dark regions of heathendom. But our Lord tells us that "this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." It is a clearly established principle of the divine government that the soul that sinneth shall die. The wages of sin is death. The destiny of all the unsaved is *death*. The Judge of all the earth will do right both with regard to the heathen and the so-called Christian nations; but as all men are mortal by nature, the dogma of eternal torments, which has sprung out of the dogma of natural immortality, must be rejected along with the huge delusion which gave it birth. The "hell" of modern theology, too horrible for either imagination or description, is as utterly unknown to Scripture as is the inalienable immortality of every child of man. The punishment of gospel

UMI

rejectors is certain. Justice requires it, and it will undoubtedly be inflicted. We know also that it will be everlasting, in the sense that all capital punishment is everlasting. If society inflicts the last sentence of the law upon a criminal the deed is irremediable. If God require the life of the transgressor it will never be restored. The penalty is final and forever. The everlasting punishment of Scripture is by Scripture itself declared to mean everlasting destruction. Conscious torment forever in the fires of hell is not a doctrine of revelation. We send it back with reprobation to its pagan source as an impossibility in the case of mortals, and an outrageous libel upon the character of the ever blessed God. The life of the future is *all holy*, and, consequently, all happy; for the life of the future is exclusively in the Holy One of God.

II. The future life revealed in Scripture is connected with resurrection. The resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ is the peculiar glory of revelation. It is the crowning proof of his divinity and Messiahship, the grand evidence of the acceptance of his sacrifice, and the solid basis of our hope of resurrection and enjoyment of the age to come. For he did not rise from the dead for himself alone, but for all whom the Father hath given to him, whom he hath repeatedly promised to raise up at "the last day." Who has not admired that piece of wonderful writing in the first letter to the Corinthians? "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." Such are some of the disastrous consequences, most logically deduced from the supposition that Christ is not risen. "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept." Here is the declaration of a fact established by the testimony of many competent and most truthful witnesses, to which is added the consoling and blessed revelation that he rose not for himself alone, but as the "firstfruits" of those that sleep in him. "Christ the firstfruits," he repeats, for Paul was full of this magnificent doctrine of everlasting victory over death—"afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." Listen also to Peter's words of exulting gratitude,

and see how in the minds of the Lord's apostles the future life is associated with resurrection: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time." These are only specimens of apostolic utterances on this great theme. *The* doctrine of these servants and apostles of the Lord was "Jesus and the resurrection." They taught that Christ was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification, and that when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then we also shall appear with him in glory. In a word, their teaching shuts us up to this conclusion—that if there be no resurrection of them that sleep in Jesus, there will be no future life whatever.

Such a conclusion will be sufficiently startling to those who send all Christians to glory as soon as their eyes are closed in death. We cannot help that. By the book of God we must go, whatever the consequence to popular beliefs and modern theology. We are quite sure that if the Scripture teaches the truth on all these matters, popular belief had better be re-examined, and modern theology had better be revised, for the teaching of the modern pulpit on the subject now under consideration, does not generally harmonize with apostolic doctrine concerning the resurrection. Indeed, the doctrine of the resurrection upon which the first ministers of Christ dwelt so frequently and fully, is but seldom presented to the contemplation of many modern congregations. In instances not a few, we have reason to believe it is not presented at all; and the ordinary teaching of glorification at death makes it all together unnecessary. If the moment Christian men close their eyes in death they open them amidst the splendors of heaven, and enjoy to the full extent of their redeemed powers the beatific vision and association with the celestial company of prophets, apostles, martyrs, and holy angels, what need is there for resurrection? If the fullness of bliss, the inconceivable joy of heavenly glory, is attained by the soul of the departed, whilst the tears of his kindred are yet falling around his lifeless body, does it not seem a descent, in every sense of the word, to come back to the world for a body, however pure and noble such body may be? Retrogression is not in har-

rejectors is certain. Justice requires it, and it will undoubtedly be inflicted. We know also that it will be everlasting, in the sense that all capital punishment is everlasting. If society inflicts the last sentence of the law upon a criminal the deed is irremediable. If God require the life of the transgressor it will never be restored. The penalty is final and forever. The everlasting punishment of Scripture is by Scripture itself declared to mean everlasting destruction. Conscious torment forever in the fires of hell is not a doctrine of revelation. We send it back with reprobation to its pagan source as an impossibility in the case of mortals, and an outrageous libel upon the character of the ever blessed God. The life of the future is *all holy*, and, consequently, all happy; for the life of the future is exclusively in the Holy One of God.

II. The future life revealed in Scripture is connected with resurrection. The resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ is the peculiar glory of revelation. It is the crowning proof of his divinity and Messiahship, the grand evidence of the acceptance of his sacrifice, and the solid basis of our hope of resurrection and enjoyment of the age to come. For he did not rise from the dead for himself alone, but for all whom the Father hath given to him, whom he hath repeatedly promised to raise up at "the last day." Who has not admired that piece of wonderful writing in the first letter to the Corinthians? "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." Such are some of the disastrous consequences, most logically deduced from the supposition that Christ is not risen. "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept." Here is the declaration of a fact established by the testimony of many competent and most truthful witnesses, to which is added the consoling and blessed revelation that he rose not for himself alone, but as the "firstfruits" of those that sleep in him. "Christ the firstfruits," he repeats, for Paul was full of this magnificent doctrine of everlasting victory over death—"afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." Listen also to Peter's words of exulting gratitude,

and see how in the minds of the Lord's apostles the future life is associated with resurrection: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time." These are only specimens of apostolic utterances on this great theme. *The* doctrine of these servants and apostles of the Lord was "Jesus and the resurrection." They taught that Christ was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification, and that when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then we also shall appear with him in glory. In a word, their teaching shuts us up to this conclusion—that if there be no resurrection of them that sleep in Jesus, there will be no future life whatever.

Such a conclusion will be sufficiently startling to those who send all Christians to glory as soon as their eyes are closed in death. We cannot help that. By the book of God we must go, whatever the consequence to popular beliefs and modern theology. We are quite sure that if the Scripture teaches the truth on all these matters, popular belief had better be re-examined, and modern theology had better be revised, for the teaching of the modern pulpit on the subject now under consideration, does not generally harmonize with apostolic doctrine concerning the resurrection. Indeed, the doctrine of the resurrection upon which the first ministers of Christ dwelt so frequently and fully, is but seldom presented to the contemplation of many modern congregations. In instances not a few, we have reason to believe it is not presented at all; and the ordinary teaching of glorification at death makes it all together unnecessary. If the moment Christian men close their eyes in death they open them amidst the splendors of heaven, and enjoy to the full extent of their redeemed powers the beatific vision and association with the celestial company of prophets, apostles, martyrs, and holy angels, what need is there for resurrection? If the fullness of bliss, the inconceivable joy of heavenly glory, is attained by the soul of the departed, whilst the tears of his kindred are yet falling around his lifeless body, does it not seem a descent, in every sense of the word, to come back to the world for a body, however pure and noble such body may be? Retrogression is not in har-

mony with God's moral processes. Whatever he does tends onward. Every step is a step in the direct line of a glorious consummation, the ideal of which was before his mind in the dateless ages of the past. If the "heaven" of the pulpit, therefore, be a reality, the "resurrection" of the New Testament is not only superfluous, but an unaccountable anomaly in the history of redemption. Both doctrines cannot be true; which shall we surrender—the popular heaven or the apostolic resurrection? In surrendering the former, which of course we do without a moment's hesitation, we lose nothing but dreams, fancies, the creations of imagination; for all that is really true about the glory, honor, and immortality are post-resurrection facts, torn from their proper place in the all-wise arrangements of God. The glory, honor, and immortality of the Lord's people are certain, and the heaven which the Lord intends for them is certain too, but these things are all future yet, and will remain so until the joyful morning of the promised resurrection.

Let us recur to 2 Tim. 1: 10. "Our Savior Jesus Christ hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." Probably these two words suggest to most readers the idea of immortal life, and nothing more; but immortality is a defective rendering of the original. Read "life and incorruption,"[1] and you have the apostle's great thought of undying life, animating the incorruptible bodies of the saints in resurrection. It is the same word that is used in 1 Cor. 15: 42, 50, 52, and in these verses correctly rendered, "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption.... Neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. ....The dead shall be used incorruptible." The real truth is that we have *no* revelation of a future life apart from resurrection. The resurrection and the impartation of that life which is for ever to animate the incorruptible body will take place at the same time. Jesus is the resurrection and the life. When he called Lazarus to life he raised him. Immortality and incorruption form the double boon of the children of God, the double glory of that portion of the human race, who through God's rich grace are to attain to the resurrection of life. A higher manhood will then behold the wonderful works of God, and reflect his glorious character, and do his perfect will, and celebrate his most worthy praise. These sons of the new creation, no

[1] *Athanasia*—immortality. Who only hath immortality. (1 Tim. 6: 16.) *Aphtharsia*—incorruption, exemption from decay. (2 Tim. 1: 10.)

longer animated by the corrupt blood of the first Adam, but by the pure spirit of the second, will be alike incapable of sin, weariness, pain, sorrow or death. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." "If the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body."

Now does all this look like retrogression? Is there any backward step here? Any coming down from the higher to the lower? Is it not, on the contrary a wonderful development of the profound wisdom and mighty love of God in Christ? He has at last completely realized the desire of his heart and the design of his mind. At last he sees his image fairly reflected in man; he sees the likeness of his beloved Son multiplied in many sons brought to glory, and he rests in his love and rejoices in the issues of his grace. And at last he beholds the perfect manhood in Christ Jesus of that portion of a mortal race which has been redeemed from sin, corruption, and mortality, and endowed with holiness, incorruption and immortality; and with them he will hold Fatherly fellowship amidst the beauties and glories of the ages to come. It is altogether great and wonderful, and demonstrates the profound truth of two brief but most comprehensive words, "God is light," and "God is love." And these considerations surely show us something of the priceless value of the atonement, or reconciliation to God by the precious blood of Christ. How surprisingly they misunderstand us who say that the doctrine of the future life in Christ only robs the Savior's atonement of its meaning! Never was there a greater or more painful misapprehension. I cannot speak for others except in so far as they are pleased to open their minds to me on this sacred subject, but for myself, I must say that my gratitude to God for the mediatorial work and sacrifice of the Redeemer has been sensibly deepened since I saw that there is no life whatever for men in the ages to come, except they are made partakers of the divine nature in the Son of the Blessed. I see in the death and resurrection of Christ a depth of wisdom and a fullness of grace which testify most emphatically to the guilt, helplessness, and mortality of man, and to the high and holy sense in which be-

lievers in Jesus are made by the life-giving Spirit sons and heirs of God. Any doctrine which militated against, or in the slightest degree weakened my apprehension of the value of my Redeemer's one offering, I should instantly suspect as unsound. For I find the putting away of sin by the sacrifice of the spotless Lamb of God taught throughout the entire Scripture. In promise, symbol, type, prophecy, doctrine, history, allusion, and inference, it is taught. The whole Aaronic economy is unintelligible without it. Some of the grandest predictions of the future royal glory of the Son of Man are based upon the accomplished work of his high priesthood. The evangelical history of the meek and holy sufferer, the Good Shepherd that gave his life for the sheep, is to me utterly perplexing except by the solution that "He died for us, that he might bring us to God." The apostolic epistles, too, are constructed upon the principle that we are not our own but bought with a price. Peter's words are the key-note of the music of salvation, "Ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifested in these last times for you, who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God." And upon the same fundamental doctrine of redemption by the blood of Christ the apocalyptic victors found their joyous song: "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth." No, no! The doctrine of life only in Christ does not depreciate but greatly enhances the value of the atonement. All men are mortal, and only mortal by nature, therefore no man has any inherent right to a future life, or any inherent qualifications, that make the possession of a future life possible; but God so loved the world, this sinful, mortal race, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. Here is grace laying hold of a great number of mortals, and uniting them to Christ who died for them, making them new creatures and endowing them with the godlike gift of immortality. *All* would have perished after

their allotted time on earth but for this. If *any* are made "Sons of God" it is only through him who died for them and rose again. As sin reigned unto death, so grace reigns through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.

III. The resurrection life revealed in Scripture will be manifested at the second coming of our Lord. When that great event shall take place, with all its attendant circumstances of august solemnity, we do not know. It is one of the secret things which belong to God. It may be that many further changes yet will occur in our distracted world before the Son of man is revealed. Or it may be that with the suddenness of the lightning flash he may surprise mankind. Two things, however, are certain: his people are urged to wait and look for his return as if no other event must *necessarily* occur before, and the realization of their hope depends upon his return. These propositions are so manifestly justified by Scripture, that they are not likely to be questioned. Nevertheless a few references will remind us of what is at once profoundly instructive as doctrine, and eminently fitted to have the best practical effect. The new creation in Christ Jesus, by which believers are constituted sons of God, is to be followed by the adoption or redemption of the body at the coming of the Lord, by which they will be manifested as such. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know," it is a fact perfectly established among us, and without controversy, "that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." When the Lord counsels his disciples to seek the kingdom of God, he also says to them, "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately." "Even we ourselves," writes Paul, "who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, that is the redemption of our body." When expressing his gratitude to God for the grace given to the Christians at Corinth, he says, "Ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." Declaring his confidence in the church of the Thessalonians, he adds the prayer, "The Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ." In a former letter he had reminded them

how they had turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God, "and to wait for his Son from heaven, even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come." Inculcating watchfulness in view of the advent, Jesus says, "Watch, therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come;" and again, "Watch, therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh." "Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is. For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch. Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the Master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cockcrowing, or in the morning: lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch." "Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and stand before the Son of man." Speaking of the enemies of the cross of Christ, who mind earthly things, and whose end is destruction, Paul introduces this vivid contrast: "Our citizenship is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working of his power, whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews has the same sublime thought expressed in other words: "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ," are soul-stirring words which express the attitude of the early Christians ere the church had left her first love, and settled down amidst the luxuries and corruptions of the world. It is at his appearing and his kingdom that Christ is to judge the quick and the dead. It is then that he gives reward to his servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear his name small and great; and it is then too that he bestows the crown of

righteousness, not on Paul only, but upon all them also that love his appearing.

Now there is an imposing grandeur about all this which we cannot adequately realize. The thought of the once rejected and crucified Savior returning in glory to take possession of his own world, and to set up a kingdom co-extensive with its utmost limits, whilst he raises the dead that have loved him, though unseen, clothes them with incorruptibility, and makes them kings and priests, the high ministers of state in the coming age—is overwhelmingly grand; and yet that thought is simply the condensed idea of many a glowing prophecy and promise in both Testaments. And is it not right that it should be so? Would we have it otherwise if we had a voice in the matter? Do we not rather praise his Father and our Father for planning it all with such infinite wisdom? He was put to shame for us. Let us rejoice that he is to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all them that believe, in that day. He was the Man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief. Let us rejoice that his heart is to be filled with gladness when he sees his ransomed around him pure in *his* purity, bright in *his* glory, immortal in *his* life. With a mock sceptre and mock purple men made sport of his claims to royalty. Let us rejoice that he is appointed heir of all things, and that in the time determined by the Father, all kings shall fall down before him, and all nations shall serve him. When that day dawns, those whom he has chosen out of the world to witness the glory which the Father hath given him will understand, as they cannot understand at present, the wisdom of God in the mystery of godliness. Certain it is, in the meantime, that the very thought of cleansing the universe, and giving eternal life to any of the sons of men, is full both of love and wisdom, and sheds a lustre upon the character of God such as any possible representation of ordinary theology fails to do. Labored attempts have been made, times without number, to reconcile the idea of the eternal misery of countless multitudes of the human family with the love, holiness, and justice of the Most High; but these attempts are all utter and palpable failures, however praiseworthy the motive which gave them birth. The moral sense of humanity is shocked beyond description at the idea of a hell of relentless torture and torment in one department of creation, and that of a heaven of inexpressible felicity in another, whose songs of adoratian are never for a moment

checked by the consciousness that terror and wo unutterable are being hopelessly endured elsewhere. Every man with a sane conscience must feel that this violent contrast in the everlasting experience of persons who were originally from the same stock, is incompatible with the declared equity of God's righteous government. But when we throw aside the pages of traditional theology, and come to those of divine inspiration, it is like an escape from a bewildering labyrinth to the open fields radiant with sunlight and fragrant with the odors of flowers. We find ourselves delivered from a dismal tyranny, which has made life a burden and mockery, and brought under the sceptre of the Supreme Love, where joy counterbalances the sorrows incident to the present time, and hope turns everything into a golden glory for all the days of the blissful perfect future. It is found that there are many mansions in the Father's house, but after the decision of the great white throne not a solitary dungeon in all his dominions. Evil is no more. Evil men and evil angels are all dead, dead forever. Life floods the universe. God in Christ, and Christ in men, forever and forever. God is all and in all through the blissful ages of a true eternity. This is the doctrine, the wonderfully glorious Scripture doctrine of a future life. Let us adore God for it, and make it our own by gratefully accepting the gift of life everlasting, so freely offered to us all without money and without price. Amen.

THE DOCTRINE OF ETERNAL PUNISHMENT CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO ETHICAL SCIENCE.

BY JAMES WILLIAM BARLOW, FELLOW AND TUTOR OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.[1]

The question whether all morality is, or is not, resolvable into conformity with the Divine will, has been pertinaciously discussed by writers on Moral Philosophy. In other words, Does an act become "right" solely in consequence of the command of God, or, on the other hand, are there certain antecedent relations, or "eternal differences," in things themselves, in consequence of which, certain acts are pronounced "right," others "wrong," according as they agree or disagree with these eternal differences? But the profound speculations of these writers have, as far as this question is concerned, led to no result whatever. Here, as in all cases where the problem trenches upon the misty domain of metaphysics, the *materials* for its solution are wanting, and no intellectual web-spinning can supply their place.

But, fortunately for our present purpose, we need not seek to unravel the enigma. Our task is much simpler; we have only to decide a question of facts. Is it a fact that our Creator has formed us in such a manner that we are capable of pronouncing certain acts to be right, and others to be wrong, without considering whether they have been commanded by him or not? To answer this question affirmatively or negatively, we need only appeal to consciousness; and consciousness at once determines *that we have been so formed;* and, further, it tells us that we have been furnished with a rule or standard of right and wrong, of such extraordinary nature, that we are capable of comparing with it, an act, or alleged act, of the Almighty himself, and thus, as it were, passing judgment upon our Maker.

Let us take an example: Suppose any one asserts as a fact that "God has created an infant for the purpose of manifesting his power and glory by consigning it, after an hour's existence in

[1] From his work—*Eternal Death and Eternal Punishment.*

this world, to unending torture." Conscience at once replies "It is a wicked act; Omnipotence does not justify it." There is no hesitation about the decision. The moral faculty spontaneously passes judgment on an act ascribed, by hideous blasphemy, to the Creator. The delivery of the judgment, and, therefore, the existence of the faculty which judged, are simple matters of fact.

Now we must be careful not to forget by whom this faculty was implanted within us; for this will greatly facilitate our decision as to whether an alleged act of God is rightly ascribed to him or not. For, if conscience unequivocally condemns such an alleged act, the question to be decided is no longer the impracticable—"Is abstract morality dependent or not on the Divine will?" but, "Is it probable that our Creator has implanted in us a faculty by the unavoidable exercise of which we condemn his own acts?"[1] This latter question admits, I think, of but one answer. We may, therefore, hold that an act, alleged to proceed from God, must be considered as erroneously referred to its author, if it be clearly and unambiguously rejected by the moral faculty.[2]

But at this stage of the investigation we are met by two difficulties. It is alleged, in the first place, that this moral faculty, or conscience, having shared the general corruption of man's nature in the Fall, cannot any longer be relied on as a guide in morals; and, in the second, that our judgments, on moral subjects, are by no means fixed, as in mathematics; but that what is "right" to one individual, or nation, or period, is "wrong" to another individual, or nation, or period, and *vice versa*.

As for the former difficulty, it need not delay us long. We have the unambiguous authority of the New Testament, as well as the evidence of our own consciousness, for maintaining

[1] That the moral faculty is capable of pronouncing upon the acts of God, is plainly the doctrine of the Bible. "That be far from thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked: and that the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from thee. Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" (Gen. 18: 25.) "God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labor of love." (Heb. 6: 10.) In this latter passage the inspired writer has gone much further than we should have ventured without such authority. (See also Rom. 3: 26.)

[2] "Reason," says Butler, "is indeed the only faculty we have wherewith to judge concerning anything, even revelation itself." And he is careful not to be misunderstood to assert "that a supposed revelation cannot be proved false, from internal characters. For, it may contain clear immoralities or contradictions; and either of these would prove it false." (*Analogy*, Part 2, ch. 3.) A few pages further on, in the same chapter, he explains more fully what he means by this function of reason in passing judgment upon the morality of Scripture—"not whether it contains things different from what we should have expected from a wise, just, and good Being; but whether it contains things plainly contradictory to wisdom, justice, or goodness; to what the light of nature teaches us of God." Now, what things are "plainly contradictory to wisdom, justice, and goodness," must be determined by the moral faculty of each individual—the faculty of highest order with which human beings have been endowed, notwithstanding any theories of Mr. Buckle.

that obscuration of the moral faculty was not, or, at least, was to a very inconsiderable extent, the result of the fall of man. Such obliteration of the moral faculty would have been, indeed, a very singular result of eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Depravation of the will, not confusion of the moral judgment, was plainly the specific deterioration. We see well enough in most cases what we ought to do, though unhappily we often fail to do it. No writer could lay down this doctrine more explicitly than St. Paul. I need only refer to one well-known passage—"For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing, one another."[1] What position these Gentiles, who were thus a law unto themselves, occupied in the scale of morality, we learn from the latter part of the first chapter. They were sunk in sins of such deep dye that they cannot now be named—in sins "from which the depraved nature of man, ever prone to sin, shrinks back with horror." And yet *even these* were a law unto themselves; the voice of conscience was not silent in their breasts.

As for the second difficulty—the diversity of men's moral judgments—it is not to be so easily got rid of. That this diversity is often greatly exaggerated, has been clearly shown by many writers on Ethical Philosophy.[2] Still, it is a fact that men do not *always* agree in their moral estimates of particular acts; and—the ultimate appeal being to the sentiment of right and wrong—if one man asserts that his conscience tells him a certain act is *right*, while another, with equal knowledge of the circumstances, asserts that *his* conscience pronounces it *wrong*, it would appear that the discussion must terminate. In such cases I believe that the only method by which we can arrive at a decision is the old induction *per enumerationem simplicem*. The human moral faculty is, as a general rule, sound and healthy; and, if we find a moral proposition deliberately affirmed as right, by nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand of our civilized fellow-men, we may feel tolerably confident that the decision is correct. Whether the assertors *act* in conformity with

[1] Rom. 2: 14, 15.

[2] See, for example, Dugald Stewart's *Philosophy of the Active and Moral Powers*. Book 2, ch. 3 and 4.

UMI

their decision or not, does not in the least affect the question Such an appeal will be sufficient to eliminate the *idola specus*—the peculiarities of the individual—from the general moral determinations of humanity.

Still I am very far from supposing that an appeal to the verdict of our fellow-men will, in all cases, lead us to a definite result; and, for this reason, I am not disposed to lay any great stress upon the proposition that the eternity of future punishment is condemned by the moral faculty. The assertion that endless torments will be inflicted upon a creature, by the being of infinite love and justice who made him, involves, to my mind, a contradiction in terms. It contradicts my notion of love,[1] and I can no more admit the love of God to cease, than I can admit his life, or his intelligence to cease. I believe, further, that most men, who have bestowed sufficient reflection upon the meaning of the proposition, hold the same view. But *some* will assuredly be found who do not perceive the contradiction; and, I fear, many more who will *assert* that they do not see it; it will, therefore, be necessary to examine, at some length, the arguments by which the defenders of eternal punishment[2] attempt to justify its infliction. I think that in the course of this examination, the essential contradiction which exists between the two conceptions, "The Infinite Torment of a creature," and, "The Infinite Love of God," will be brought into still clearer light.

This investigation is the more necessary, inasmuch as many of the apologists appear to consider that the contradiction,—which they must surely admit to be, at least, *apparent*,—is sufficiently met by a simple notice that the great problem, What is the origin of Evil? is, on all hands, admitted to be absolutely insoluble.[3]

[1] I am quite willing to admit the the above proposition to be consistent with the attribute of the Divine Love, provided we agree to define that "Love" as something exactly the reverse of the human affection so named.

[2] It will be observed that Mr. Barlow uses the phrase "eternal punishment" in its theological sense of eternal misery or conscious suffering. Eternal *death* is eternal punishment. Theologians have endeavored to appropriate the latter words to conscious suffering, and have so far succeeded that most readers understand "eternal punishment" and "eternal anguish" to be synonymous terms. This is confusion of ideas, and gives the argument for eternal misery from Matt. 25 : 46 its strength. As soon as it is seen that death is a punishment, the force of the antithesis in that passage is apparant at once; *life* and *death* are set over against each other here, as throughout the Scriptures. The phrase "eternal punishment" belongs to *extinctionists* as truly as to defenders of ceaseless torture. W. L. H.

[3] For instance, with respect to the argument of some who reject eternal punishment on the grounds that it cannot be that evil shall continue for ever, but that some time or other there shall be a complete victory of good, whereby sin and suffering shall be finally expelled from the universe, Dr. Salmon remarks as follows: "Alas! the existence of evil is the very subject on which our wishes, or our theoretical speculations, as to what ought to be, can least be trusted to inform us correctly what does take place. That a God of infinite love and power should permit evil to exist now, is a thing of which nothing but positive experience could convince us."—*Sermon on the Eternity of Future Punishment*, p. 15.

It is not, I think, difficult to point out the error into which the apologists aforesaid have here fallen.

It is perfectly true that the general question as to the origin of evil, has been long since rightly abandoned as insoluble by almost all schools of philosophers.[1] But the particular point at which the existence of evil changes from the *inexplicable fact*, to the *contradiction of a Divine Attribute*, is, with equal invariability, overlooked:—"The real riddle of existence,"—says Mr. Mansel, "the problem which confounds all philosophy,—aye, and all religion too, so far as religion is a thing of man's reason,—is the fact that evil exists *at all;* not that it exists for a longer or a shorter duration. Is not God infinitely wise and holy and powerful *now?* and does not sin exist along with that infinite holiness and wisdom and power? Is God to become more holy, more wise, more powerful hereafter; and must evil be annihilated to make room for his perfections to expand? Does the infinity of his eternal nature ebb and flow with every increase or diminution in the sum of human guilt and misery? Against this immovable barrier of the existence of evil, the waves of philosophy have dashed themselves unceasingly since the birthday of human thought, and have retired broken and powerless, without displacing the minutest fragment of the stubborn rock; without softening one feature of its dark and rugged surface."[2]

To this statement I make no substantial objection; for, I presume, Mr. Mansel does not mean to deny that the difficulty is much *increased* by the supposition that evil is infinite. The existence of evil is *inexplicable*, but it is not *contradictory* to the Divine attribute of love. And I can go further: I can admit, in one way, the infinity of evil and yet retain my confidence in that love. For my own part, I do indeed *hope* that a time will come when all evil shall have ceased throughout the entire field of God's creation; when "all but the incorrigibly bad" shall have been restored to goodness, and the excepted ones shall have ceased to live. But I could not venture to *teach* that evil will ever cease to exist; the lamp of God, the moral sense, has not decided the question for me. I can admit even everlasting evil,

[1] There is a great deal of nonsense talked about the origin of sin. It is the unavoidable contingency of the creation of *free agents*. The power to choose between obedience and disobedience involves the *possibility* of sin. Some creatures have disobeyed, and thus sin was introduced into the universe. W. L. H.

[2] *Bampton Lectures*. Lect. 7, p. 232. And, similarly,—"That this 'moral evil' should have existed at all, much more to so immense an extent, under the administration of *supposed* infinite power, wisdom, and benevolence, is the great difficulty."—*Eclipse of Faith*, p. 127.

and yet hold fast my trust in the justice and mercy and love of Almighty God.

But, at the next step, the moral sense passes judgment and forbids me to go further. It forbids me to admit as possible the infinite duration of evil *in one and the same created sentient subject.* Here we have reached the point at which the existence of evil changes its aspect from the insoluble mystery to the contradiction of an attribute of God.[1] I can admit the existence of evil; I can admit its eternal existence; but, if I felt myself constrained to admit its eternal existence in one and the same living creature, I should at once sink down helplessly into the deadliest of heresies,—the heresy of heresies—in comparison with which the wildest dreams of the Gnostic or Manichæn were harmless reveries—I mean the heresy of doubting the justice and goodness of my Creator.[2]

For, I am absolutely unable to justify the infliction of so terrific a sentence as unending sin and misery upon a finite being, created by God's hand. Reflecting again, that the suffering of a single immortal spirit would reduce, by comparison, to an imperceptible speck, the whole prodigious load of misery under which the whole creation has groaned from the beginning, I cannot conceive any finite sin *deserving* such a doom.[3] I cannot conceive it proceeding from a *merciful* being. The sentence appears to be clearly repugnant not only to mercy but to justice. It surely requires some explanation. The *onus probandi* rests

[1] The uniformity with which the defenders of eternal punishment ignore this obvious distinction is absolutely marvellous. Archer Butler argues as follows:—"If it be urged—wildly urged—that the sufferer might be annihilated, and so the miserable bond of wickedness and wo dissolved for ever: we reply, so too he *might* never have existed; at any moment you select in the countless ages to come, how should that wretched spirit cease to exist on any ground which will not be as applicable to any *other* period, or which will not equally show he ought never to have existed at all?"—In this 'reply' the ideas of finite and infinite are assumed to have no difference. Infinite torment of the sinner *contradicts* the Divine morality. His creation is only an *inexplicable* fact.

[2] Mr. Maurice, in the preface to the second edition of his *Theological Essays*, remarks: "I admire unspeakably those who can believe in the love of God, and can love their brethren, in spite of the opinion which they seem to cherish, that he has doomed them to destruction. I am sure that their faith is as much purer and stronger than mine, as it is than their own system." (p. 26.) If by "destruction" we are here to understand "everlasting torments," I, for my part, estimate their alleged love of their brethren at a very small amount.

[3] It is a common Protestant dogma that any single unrepented sin, however trivial in our eyes, *deserves* eternal torture. You fall asleep for a minute or two in church, at afternoon service, on a hot day: of course you should have been attending to the service; but, honestly and truly, do you clearly see and feel that those two minutes' sleep *deserves, at the hand of Infinite Justice*, everlasting agony? And, if you do not see it, why should you profess to do so? "The Catholic Church holds it better for the sun and moon to drop from heaven, for the earth to fall, and for all the many millions on it to die of starvation in extremest agony, as far as temporal affliction goes, than that one soul... will not say, should be lost, but should commit one single venial sin, should tell one willful untruth, or should steal one poor farthing without excuse."—Newman (John Henry), *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, p. 384. This language is sufficiently strong, but, in comparison with the above dogma, it is mild and reasonable.

upon its supporters; let us see what they have to allege on its behalf.

The first explanatory theory which I shall notice is a very ancient one; and indeed, only for its reproduction in Dr. Salmon's sermon, before referred to, I should have passed it by. Though not laying any stress upon it, he evidently regards it with some complacency. It is as follows: "Sin being an offence against an infinite being, cannot be atoned for by any finite sufferings; and therefore, the least sin of man requires as its atonement either the eternal punishment of the offender, or the suffering of one who is infinite." As for this argument, if indeed it deserves the name of argument, the old retort is far more than sufficient as a reply: "Sin being *committed by* a finite creature, requires only the finite punishment of the offender, or a finite satisfaction." The retort, I say, is more than sufficient, inasmuch as the intensity of an offense is always in proportion to the moral and intellectual capacities *of the offender*, and not to the dignity of him against whom it has been committed. This latter element comes into consideration, in aggravation of the fault, only so far as that dignity was known *to the offender at the time* when that fault was committed. And, as the infinite nature of God does not, and cannot, come under the cognition of the sinner, no transcendental penal results can be justified therefrom.

The theory, as stated above, is so palpably worthless that its refutation is unnecessary; it may, however, be presented in a much more plausible form.

Admitting the divinity of the Savior, it is urged that sin *did* require an infinite atonement; and, therefore, must involve some inconceivable malignity, in consequence of which the infliction of eternal punishment is a justifiable act, in all cases which that infinite atonement does not cover. I invite attention to this form of the argument, for I believe a serious and dangerous error is here involved. The reasoning is stated as follows by Abp. Magee:

"The Scriptures proclaim the divinity of Christ; and so far are we from inferring this attribute of our Lord from the necessity of an infinite satisfaction, that we infer *from it*, both the great love of our Almighty Father, who has spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all; *and the great heinousness of human guilt, for the expiation of which, it was deemed fit that so great a being should suffer.*"[4]

[4] Dissertations on the Atonement, No. 13. To the same effect Archer Butler: "The eternity of punishment is but the counterpart of that other mystery of the unspeakable

It is the last clause of this argument, (that in Italics) to which I object, as containing a serious logical error. The great love of the Father to the human race, as instanced in the sacrifice of Christ, is, over and over again, asserted in the New Testament; and the assertion is in perfect harmony with the dictates of our moral nature. But the inference as to "the great heinousness of human guilt" from the tremendous sacrifice required to expiate it, is simply an excursion of the human intellect into a region which lies beyond its sphere. *To us*, indeed, the spectacle of the Son taking our nature, and dying on the cross, is a tremendous mystery of love; it is so represented by the sacred writers; and is, most likely, regarded in the same light, even by beings of higher order than ourselves. But, *considered as a transaction between the two Divine persons*, the death of Jesus is an event whose nature is absolutely and hopelessly unknown to us, because the materials for thought and speculation are wanting. The ablest man who ever walked this earth is as incompetent as an infant or a savage, to form a conception of what took place between the Father and the Son when Jesus gave up the ghost on Calvary; and yet, to deduce an inference as to "the great heinousness of guilt" from his death, that event must be considered *as a transaction between the Father and the Son*. Some theologians have gone so far as to speculate on the probability that, in consequence of the death of Jesus, this little globe of ours is the cynosure of the celestial spheres; and this is another instance of the same confusion—confusion of things in relation to us, with things in relation to God. For how can any one venture to deny that in some other parts of creation events may take place, or may have taken place, which, if we knew them, would to us appear equally stupendous?

The argument of Abp. Magee may, in fact, be regarded as "a specimen of the confident manner in which men of all ages, and under all religious systems, have been prone to dogmatize upon the highest matters of speculation, upon no better basis than the absence of all materials for speculating at all." Aristotle endeavors to prove that the happiness of the gods consists in contemplation. His argument is based on the ground that we cannot ascribe to them moral attributes like our own, inasmuch as

malignity of sin, which itself is demonstrated by that third tremendous mystery of the Divine atonement it required."—*Sermons, Doctrinal and Practical*, 2d Series, p. 384. This proof of one mystery by another mystery, which again is proved by a third mystery, and in which the resulting mystery is in flat contradiction with the dictates of the moral faculty, can scarcely be regarded as a satisfactory logical process.

there would be no scope for them to operate—if there be no pain, how can there be fortitude, if no evil desires, how can there be temperance? In other words,—The happiness of the gods must consist in contemplation, for, *we cannot conceive* in what else it can consist. Magee argues that the heinousness of sin must be something transcendent, because *we cannot conceive*, under other circumstances, the necessity for so great an atonement. The error involved in both arguments is precisely the same—a deficiency of materials for thought to operate upon, is confounded with a logical impossibility.

"It is quite true," says Dr. Salmon, "that we who are deeply stained with sin ourselves, and who live among sinners, must form most inadequate conceptions of the malignity of sin." This I do not dispute. I admit it unreservedly. The further we advance towards moral perfection—the nearer we approach our Creator—we shall see, I doubt not, all the more clearly, how dreadful it must be to act in opposition to his most holy will. Thus only can we understand what St. Paul meant when he called himself "the chief of sinners."[1] This was no piece of idle declamation. He meant it literally. Good and holy as we should have considered him to be, there was perhaps no man then living who had a deeper conviction of the intensity of his own sin.

But the fact that the subjective feeling of the malignity of sin, increases with the acuteness of the moral faculty, must not be pushed to a consequence which violates a fundamental principle of Ethics. That an offender should be held responsible for that amount *only* of moral illumination which he possessed *when he committed the offence*, must be laid down as the basis of any just judgment upon his guilt.[2] If, under some new conditions of being, the moral perceptions of the sinner should be raised, so as to enable him to view a past sinful act in a wholly new light; and if, in consequence of his intensified conscience, he should be held liable to a tremendous punishment, the judgment would be pronounced, by every moral philosopher, to be a flagrant act of injustice. The improved moral faculty can legitimately increase

[1] 1 Tim. 1:15.

[2] The only exception to this general principle is the case of the man who has blunted and deadened the voice of conscience by habitual sin. Such a person may be held responsible, by the light of his primitive conscience, even for acts committed when that conscience had become dim. The principle itself is plainly recognized in the Collect for the twelfth Sunday after Trinity, when we pray—"Pour down upon us the abundance of thy mercy; forgiving us those things *whereof our conscience is afraid*."

the penalty only on *subsequent* transgressions. We never think of judging acts of the fifteenth century by the moral standard of the nineteenth.

But the theory that a creature may fairly be held responsible for an act of sin, at the tribunal of a higher conscience than that which he possessed when he committed it, may be most easily exposed by the *reductio ad absurdum*,—and indeed the same method is eminently applicable to most of the defences of eternal punishment, which are based upon ethical grounds. Let us apply the process to a particular case—A tiger springing from an Indian jungle, seizes a traveller, carries him off, and devours him. The brute does not know that he is doing anything wrong. But it is quite possible to conceive that, in some future state of existence, the Almighty might confer upon him sufficient moral perception to understand that it was a serious crime to destroy, willfully, a being higher than himself in the scale of creation, and upon whom the Ruler of the world had devolved authority over all the lower animals. Could we, then, consider the tiger, convinced of sin, to be *justly* liable to everlasting pain?

Or, to take another example—Any who have had much to do with young children, are aware that they attain to a knowledge of right and wrong at a very early age indeed. A quick little child of two years old, or even younger, knows very well that it is naughty to get into a passion and strike his mother or his nurse. His elders, however, do not think a great deal of his little ebullition of temper, and consider it amply expiated by sending him to bed. But the child may die suddenly in his sin. Will the "All Merciful" consign him to everlasting tortures? Why not? It is true, *we* think lightly of his sin, but "we who are deeply stained with sin ourselves, and who live among sinners, must form inadequate conceptions of the malignity of sin." And, further,—to anticipate another, and most horrible, argument,—the eternal torments of the child may be of use in other parts of the universe, by acting as a warning to their more favored inhabitants, and keeping them steady in the right path, "by the terrible spectacle of the results of indulged sin"—a spectacle which, "for all we can tell," may be more strikingly beneficial from the fact of its being a child that suffers!

And this detestable conclusion is simply a logical development of the principles on which such arguments are based. He who accepts a theory must be prepared to stand by its legitimate

consequences. But where is the man who would dare to come forward and say that any conceivable amount of intense bliss, accruing to the inhabitants of the spheres which roll round Alioh or Algol, from the contemplation of the everlasting agony of his child, would avail to dispel his sorrow? What power could stop the silent judgment of his conscience on the being who passed the sentence?

According to Mr. Mansel, the whole apparent force of the moral objection to eternal punishment rests upon two purely gratuitous assumptions. "It is assumed, in the first place, that God's punishment of sin in the world to come is so far analogous to man's administration of punishment in this world, that it will take place as a special infliction, not as a natural consequence. And is assumed, in the second place, that punishment will be inflicted solely with reference to the sins committed during the earthly life;—that the guilt will continue finite, while the misery is prolonged to infinity."[1] Let us consider these assumptions.

As for the former, I presume that Mr. Mansel, in holding, with Bp. Butler, that the punishment of sin in the next world may take place as a natural consequence, does not mean to deny that this natural consequence is simply the operation of laws ordained by God himself. If this be so,—and I will not cast upon Mr. Mansel the imputation of denying it,—I cannot see how the *moral* aspect of the question is, in the slightest degree, altered. The moral objection is—the infliction of unending torments involves infinite cruelty. Mr. Mansel's reply is—God inflicts these torments by a general law. What on earth has that to do with the question?

As for the second assumption—"that punishment will be inflicted solely with reference to the sins committed during the earthly life"—the reply, that sin may continue beyond the grave, is a favorite argument with the defenders of eternal punishment. Archer Butler, Mansel, and Salmon, all dilate upon it; and I do not dispute the assertion; the continuance of sin is possible, perhaps probable. "Can an immortal soul," asks Mr. Mansel, "incur God's wrath and condemnation, only so long as it is united to a mortal body?" I am quite ready to grant the possibility; but we may put a counter-question—"Can an immortal soul obtain God's forgiveness, only so long as it is united to a

[1] *Bampton Lectures*. Lect. 7.

UMI

ment of the principles on which such arguments are based. He who accepts a theory must be prepared to stand by its legitimate

soul obtain God's forgiveness, only so long as it is united to a

[1] *Bampton Lectures*. Lect. 7.

UMI

mortal body?" I cannot see on what *a priori* grounds this question must be answered in the negative.

But this particular argument may perhaps be best met by a dilemma. The damned either can or cannot avoid sinning in their dreadful home. If we hold the latter alternative, the argument, considered as a justification of eternal punishment on moral grounds, is simply a contemptible quibble, wholly unworthy of the three eminent men whose arguments are under discussion: if we adopt the former, I cannot see how these writers can avoid at least a *possibility* of restoration for some of the lost; for, I can hardly think that they would maintain that if, in the midst of his torments, one of the wretched beings were to abandon his sin, he would still be detained in hopeless agony.[1]

I come now to the consideration of the argument in support of eternal punishment, which, in reference to ethical science, must be regarded as the worst of all; the worst at least of any which I intend to discuss.[2] It may be very shortly stated. The everlasting torture of a few may be necessary in order to confirm the everlasting happiness of a great many.

This, I say, considered as an ethical position, is by far the worst of the arguments we have yet met with. That the eternal suffering of A may be useful to B, or, to put it more strongly, may be indispensable to the happiness of B, is not even a palliation for its infliction. Each individual's case must be judged on its own merits, and on its own merits alone. These writers entertain very singular views on the subject of happiness and misery. They appear to regard them as in some way analogous to commodities which can be bought and sold by the pound weight. Their theory involves the belief that a being who inflicts a certain amount of suffering on one of two individuals, neither of whom is supposed to

[1] And yet there is a passage in one of Dr. Salmon's sermons from which, I fear, it must be inferred that he would maintain this terrible position. He says (p. 19): "It seems a sufficient answer to any objection drawn from the (eternal) punishment of the wicked as inconsistent with the justice of God, that he has so constituted things that if at any time they should cease to deserve to suffer, the bitterest part of their suffering must at once cease." By "the bitterest part of his suffering," he means, their sense of irreconcilable separation from God. I should surely have thought that if, at any time, a creature "should cease to deserve to suffer" at the hand of the Infinitely Just, *all* his suffering—not merely "the bitterest part of his suffering"—would cease at once.

[2] "There is one argument for Eternal Punishment which I have not noticed, as it is too atrocious for discussion. Some Calvinistic animals that the cause of its infliction is to manifest the great power and glory of God. As for this theory I fully agree with the following remarks of Mr. Theodore Parker: 'The notion that men are "tortured for the glory of God," deserves all the scorn, all the hate, all the ribaldry, all the mockery, which it ever met with from Lucian and Lucretius, from Pomponatius and Voltaire, from Thomas Paine and Ritter, and Feuerbach; their hammer is not at all too heavy for their hard work."—*On the Function and Influence of the Idea of Immortal Life.*

deserve either reward or punishment, may be regarded as completely absolved from the charge of cruelty, provided that he confers precisely the same amount of happiness upon the other; and, further, that if the amount of happiness conferred be greater than the amount of suffering inflicted, still neglecting the merits of the recipients, the distributor, considered as a moral agent, must be classed as positively benevolent.

Now, absurd as such reasoning manifestly appears when applied to human beings, and destructive as it is to the rudiments of morality, theologians have not hesitated to apply it to the dealings of the Ruler of the world with his creatures. They teach us that the unending tortures of A may be useful in confirming B in his security, and that this is a "justification" of eternal punishment. It may be supposed that I am stating their reasoning in an exaggerated form. But here are Dr. Salmon's own words:

"It would seem like vindictiveness, if God were to raise men from the dead, and unite their bodies and souls, only in order that, having tormented them for a number of years, he might then consign them to annihilation. If annihilation be no part of God's scheme, we can understand that a soul, as long as it exists, must bear the lot in which it has involved itself. But if it be God's intention to annihilate any, pity would suggest that he will do so without inflicting preliminary torment. As justice is administered by modern humanity, criminals whose life is deemed to be inconsistent with the welfare of society are removed from the world without the infliction of unnecessary pain; and we shudder as we read how, in other days, hours of lingering torture must be sustained before the suffering wretch dared hope for the long desired mercy-stroke. Further, it is more difficult to imagine purposes served by the temporary sufferings of the wicked after this life than by their eternal punishment. Sufferings which are not supposed to end in reformation must be inflicted for the benefit, not of the offender himself, but of others. Now, we can understand that the perpetual exhibition, in the case of a few, of the terrible consequences of sin, may be the means appointed for maintaining in the many a wholesome horror of sin. It may be questioned whether any transient exercise of judgment would suffice to produce an impression certain to endure throughout eternity."[1]

This passage is amply sufficient to show that I have not exaggerated the argument, for it teaches us that though, on the merits

[1] *Sermon on the Necessity of Future Punishment*, p. —. Add to the same effect: "The infliction of pain for the sake of example is, if it be everlasting torment, . . . if made to depend for the good of the whole . . . not only on full proof of the personal demerit of the object of punishment, but also on the necessity of the example for the benefit of others, and on the impossibility of attaining the end by any other means, then it is unjust. And who can tell but that this practical proof of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, may be the necessary means for making all know how God hates sin, and thereby making them hate and dread it themselves."—

of the case alone, "it would seem like vindictiveness" on the part of God to torture his creatures for a time—and, of course, *a fortiori*, for eternity—yet the infliction is justified by the benefits which the hideous exhibition may produce in some unknown regions of the universe. The feelings which such propositions excite in me may possibly arise from some defect in my moral constitution, but I unreservedly state that I know no words sufficiently strong to express my abhorrence of such doctrine. Vicarious suffering, even of the innocent for the guilty, is in truth a common law on earth; but is not infinite, and the ideas of finite and infinite differ not in degree but in kind; above all, we have the means of justifying it in our belief of an unknown world beyond the grave where all that is amiss here will be set right. But this solution, the strongest of all the natural arguments for a future life, this last and worst argument in support of eternal punishment tears away from us.

But, in order to test its validity, let us again take a definite example. Suppose it were offered to the father of six children to take his choice whether his whole family should be annihilated in death, or that five of them should be received into heaven, and the sixth turned into hell. Let us suppose, further, that the misery of the lost child shall exactly equal, in intensity as well as in duration, the happiness of one of the saved. Should the father adopt the latter alternative, the unalloyed bliss of *four* of his children will produce a clear preponderance in the scale of total happiness. But where is the man who would dare to make such a choice? Which of the six little ones would he select as the victim whose undying pain should secure his brothers' and sisters' immortal joy? Except the wretches who blaspheme their Maker's holy name by returning him thanks for damning their neighbors to eternal woe,[1] is there any one alive who would not joyfully embrace the other offer,—who would not suffer himself and all his children to sink back for ever to the silent void from which they were called to life by the voice of God, rather than purchase the joys of heaven at such a price?

Now, if we should make this choice in the case of our own

[1] I remember having read, in some dissenting magazine, (though I cannot recover the passage,) a life of some eminent female saint of their persuasion. One morning she was observed to be unusually zealous in praising the Lord. Being asked the reason, she replied that 'great grace had been given her.' On being further interrogated as to the special mode in which the 'grace' had been manifested, it appeared that she had been enabled truly and heartily to rejoice in the contemplation of the everlasting damnation of the wicked; meaning thereby nearly all her neighbors. There can be small doubt from what spirit that 'grace' came.

children, it is manifest from the fundamental rules of ethics, that we should make precisely the same with respect to every one. In other words, no *moral* being could consent to purchase eternal happiness at the price of the eternal misery of any sentient creature; and we are thus again led to the conclusion, that the future life, if the commonly received view of it be correct, is a curse to the human race—*not to the wicked only, but to the totality*—For, if annihilation of the totality should be tendered as the alternative, no *moral* being could refuse to accept it.

And, in deducing this consequence, I have in reality conceded to some of the defenders of eternal punishment one point of very considerable importance. I have admitted the saved to be *the many*, the lost to be *the few*. Most of these writers do not, indeed, insist upon this; they admit the damnation of the vast majority; but Dr. Salmon, pressed by the tremendous difficulties of the question, differs from them. He says:

"I cannot but believe that the number who will benefit by this lesson will be beyond comparison greater than that of those who have rejected the mercy of God. Pious men have sometimes dogmatized, in a manner for which Scripture gives no warrant, about the proportion of the number saved to the lost, and have reduced to so infinitesimal amount the number of the former as to revolt men against doctrine which would seem to represent Satan as more successful in destroying than God in saving."

We must, therefore—waiving for a moment the essential injustice of inflicting eternal torments upon A for the benefit of B—examine the probability of the assertion, that more "beyond comparison" will be saved than lost. As for the dogmatism respecting the proportion of these numbers, it is perfectly evident that if a writer assigns one in a hundred, or one in a thousand, or one in a million, thereby meaning to state *a definite proportion* between the saved and lost, he must be simply a presumptuous fool; and, for such dogmatism, Scripture indeed gives no warrant. But, I take it, most of those who use similar language intend, by such expressions, only to assert that the ratio is one of very considerable inequality, the great preponderance of numbers being on the side of the lost; and, taking the words in this sense, I cannot see how their position can be assailed. In the first place we have the explicit words of Jesus Christ himself peremptorily determining the question—"Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: be-

cause strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."[1] These words are explicit; no form of speech could be clearer. There is not one of the denunciations of eternal punishment in which the grammatical signification of the sentence is more plain and definite; and what right have we in this case, any more than in the other, to depart from the plain grammatical sense? *Others* may do so, consistently with their principles of interpretation, but surely Dr. Salmon cannot claim any such right.

But, further, not only have we the supreme authority of Christ, but the entire course of our own observation, and every page of history, ancient and modern, sacred and profane, backs his words. That this is so, can hardly require discussion. We are not indeed the judges of our fellow-men, but it is impossible for us to avoid forming an *opinion* as to the spiritual condition of the majority of them. We have only to look about us as we walk through the crowded streets of the city—among the stolid agricultural population—among the wealthy mercantile classes—we may even go into the churches—how many of those around us are walking along the narrow way? How many of them are—to use the technical "evangelical" expression—"in Jesus?" Every one else, no matter how moral and decorous and generous he may be, is damned to all eternity.

And, do we doubt whether a similar state of affairs has existed through all past time since the creation of man? We turn to secular history for our answer; and what is history? Ninety-nine hundredths of it—to use again the objectionable proportion—is the history of human sin—we turn to ecclesiastical history, and find it, if possible, worse. As far as we have any means for ascertaining it, the devil's title as Prince of this world, has been stoutly maintained, in every place, and through all historic time. "The whole world lieth in wickedness,"[2] is the language of inspiration; and although when those words were penned, the Christian church was a very small body, while it now spreads over half the earth, they are still true. For we must remember that as the fold of Christ expanded in area, it unquestionably deteriorated in purity—the *intensive* development appears to have varied inversely as the *extensive*, and thus the real body of real Christians is, even now, recognized as small.

[1] Matt. 7: 13, 14. [2] 1 John 5: 19.

In fact, if we confine our thoughts to the human race, I can see only one way in which even a shadow of ground can be given for the assertion that the great majority of mankind shall be finally saved,—and that is by assuming that in the lapse of ages yet to come the proportion which has hitherto existed between the lost and the saved will be reversed. But this is altogether visionary. The civilized portions of the globe are doubtless making progress in morality, but we do not see as yet the slightest symptom of a general conversion of the world to God. Meanwhile each day, each hour, is swelling the frightful roll of perdition; while the redeemed, who are in numbers to surpass the lost "beyond comparison," are but slowly entering the mansions of their Father's house. Our Lord has told us that the day and hour of his return, was, even to himself, unknown;[1] that it cometh as a thief in the night; but this theory would postpone it inevitably to ages so remote that the previous era of man must be a span in comparison.

It is clear that Dr. Salmon was aware of the difficulty of his position, for he proceeds—"Even if it could be proved that more of mankind perish than are saved, still it has been revealed to us that the human race does not comprise the whole of God's rational creatures, and we might venture to hold the belief which our knowledge of God's goodness persuades us of." So we come back again to the horrible notion that the mass of mankind are to be eternally tortured for the benefit of other, more favored, parts of the creation. What a hideous picture does this present us of the world which God *so loved* that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life! God so loved the world that he hath set it forth to his creation as "the terrible spectacle of the results of indulged sin!" *And yet he did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved.*[2]

But we have not yet done with the passage which I have quoted (p. 49). We must now consider its final clause—"We can understand that the perpetual exhibition, in the case of a few, of the terrible consequences of sin, may be the means appointed for maintaining in the many a wholesome horror of sin. It may be

[1] Let this absurdity pass for what it is worth. Mr. Barlow evidently has not examined this question with the care and good sense he has bestowed upon that now under consideration. W. L. H.

[2] John 3: 16, 17.

questioned whether any transient exercise of judgment would suffice to produce an impression certain to endure throughout eternity." On reading these words it would naturally occur to us that, even if this everlasting spectacle of torture were absolutely indispensable to secure, beyond fear of change, the perfect fruition of the celestials, and if, as before, we were to waive the moral objections to this view, still *a change of victims* might surely take place, and those who had undergone a protracted term of suffering, might be permitted to sink to everlasting rest as from a frightful dream. But no—this is sternly rejected. "The supposition of temporary sufferings of the wicked, to be succeeded by their annihilation, appears to be quite destitute of evidence, while it does not remove a single difficulty which attends the doctrine of eternal punishment."[1]

There are, undoubtedly, persons to be found, calling themselves Christians, who openly profess their delight in gloating over the torments in store for their fellow-creatures. And it is quite plain that, to the minds of such as these, the cessation, or even any alleviation of the sufferings of the damned, so far from removing any difficulty, would form a very serious difficulty in itself; it would *ipse facto* deprive them of a large share of the joys of heaven. But, as I know that the writer, whose words I have just quoted, has no sympathy with the tenets of this repulsive school, I am quite at a loss to understand how he could ever have brought himself to write such a sentence—he can hardly have reflected much on the full meaning of its final clause.

On the twenty-first of January, 1535, a dismal tragedy was exhibited in Paris. In consequence of the detection of certain secret intrigues in which Francis I. had been engaged with the infidel Solyman the magnificent, grave doubts had arisen as to orthodoxy of the French king—doubts which his notorious connection with the schismatic Henry VIII. had no tendency to remove. Irritated by such unworthy suspicions, the descendant of St. Louis resolved to put beyond all question his zeal for the Holy Catholic Church; and, in those days, the burning of heretics was universally recognized as the most appropriate display of fiery zeal. But, as the suspicions, just mentioned, were very strong, he felt himself constrained to make some *special* manifestation; and therefore, despising the mawkish humanity of the Inquisitors, who finished off their victims by one steady, uninter-

[1] Sermon before quoted, p. 8.

rupted roast, he contrived a new machine which had the advantage of very greatly protracting the execution. In six different parts of Paris, wheels, of large diameter, were erected, so arranged that each of them, revolving slowly, with a wretched "heretic" attached to one of the spokes, plunged him for a few seconds into a roaring furnace, once in each revolution. The torment was thus enormously protracted, and the machine was in the highest degree creditable to its two inventors, Francis and the devil. We can imagine ourselves present at the frightful scene. Let us even grant the wickedness of the "heretic." Should we not rejoice greatly when the shrieks of the victim, becoming weaker and weaker at each successive plunge into the bath of fire, showed us that the torture was nearly over? Should we not execrate the barbarity of Francis in devising this infernal engine to lengthen out his pain?[1]

But, we are told this is all nonsense; the wheel may just as well revolve, and the victim shriek in agony *for ever;* for, the supposition of temporary sufferings of the wicked, to be succeeded by his annihilation, *does not remove a single difficulty which attends the doctrine of eternal punishment!*

Yes it does remove a difficulty. It removes the main difficulty. It removes a difficulty so great that, in comparison with it, all other difficulties vanish in the back-ground—the difficulty of reconciling everlasting torments inflicted on his creatures, with the character of him "whose tender mercies are over *all his works.*"[2] What tender mercies are over those who are damned to eternal torments, and are they not supposed to be his works? If everlasting misery is the result of "tender mercies," I should very much like to know what would be the result of the deadly hatred. We can, indeed, understand the words of the Psalmist, if, as before, we agree to understand by "tender mercy" something quite different from our ordinary conception of mercy, and diametrically contrary to it. And yet the attributes of the Almighty,—his justice, his mercy, his truth,—if not to us *unmeaning terms*, must be regarded as *analogous*, though no doubt very imperfectly analogous, to the corresponding affections in mankind.[3]

[1] I very much doubt that even Francis himself, would have protracted his victim's suffering for twelve months, had he been able to do it.

[2] Ps. 145: 9.

[3] The remaining clause, that the supposition of temporary sufferings of the wicked, to be succeeded by their annihilation, *appears to be quite destitute of evidence*, will be examined hereafter.

In estimating the vast importance of correct views on the subject of the eternity of future punishment, the circumstance, already alluded to, that the civilized portion of the human race has for a long time past made steady progress in morality, must not be overlooked. Any such doctrine must, to the civilized world of the nineteenth century, stand in a relation totally different from that which it bore to the mediæval semi-barbarians. And, I doubt not, that, as time rolls on, this difference will continually become more striking. I am very far indeed from wishing to extenuate the peculiar vices which usually attend a high state of civilization, but there can be no question that the brutal indifference to human suffering, or, to speak more correctly, the barbarous delight in witnessing its infliction in the most frightful forms, which characterized the middle ages, has greatly diminished. In this particular respect, the improvement in public feeling has been, for several centuries, steadily progressive. Exhibitions of torture, which were witnessed with applause in the streets of London, in the days of the Tudors, would have raised a riot in the middle of the last century; and yet it is well-known that a judge in the last century was capable of sending to the gallows a girl of eighteen, with an infant at her breast, for attempting to steal, when starving, a small piece of cloth from a shop in London. This steady increase in humanity is an indisputable fact. The doctrine that the Supreme Being designs to torture many of his creatures everlastingly, may, possibly, not have been much out of place in an age when a nobleman was capable of gouging out the eyes of a little child with his own noble hands, in consequence of having received some insult from its father.[1] But the fundamental principles of morality are now better understood; the doctrine of eternal punishment contradicts them flatly; and I have no doubt that this essential contradiction will, day by day, be more clearly discerned.[2]

Now it is admitted, by almost every class of Christians, that the *moral* evidences of the truth of revealed religion, derived from the purity of its teaching, form a most essential portion of its defences; a portion too, which, so far from suffering from the

[1] A well-authenticated feat of the Norman baron, Robert de Belesme. (Eleventh Century.)

[2] Richard Baxter was a very worthy man, and yet he thought his famous argument about the flea (quoted by Dr. Salmon,—Appendix, p. 41) sound and irrefragable; and, very probably it may have been generally admitted as valid, two hundred years ago. Should the world last two hundred years longer, I doubt not that the notion of God's torturing eternally one class of his creatures, for the behoof of another class, will then be regarded with as much scorn as 'Baxter's flea' is now.

lapse of time, will continually acquire strength. Historical evidence, on the other hand, is, by its very nature, liable to deteriorate; our ancient manuscripts will, in the course of centuries, decay or be destroyed; a competent knowledge of the original languages of the sacred books and contemporary documents may not be kept up. I am very far, indeed, from admitting that this species of evidence will ever become evanescent, but it is essentially liable to become weaker, as ages roll on. To the believer in the truth of Christianity, therefore, it must be most important that the moral evidences of his faith should be preserved unimpeachable; and what will become of the moral evidence, if assent to a proposition which cuts up morality by the roots, is peremptorily demanded as essential?

Without doubt, the aspect of nature is often stern, and dark, and threatening. I admit that "the blasted trunk, the barren rock, the frowning precipice, the roar of the whirlpool, the fury of the storm," do, indeed, speak a terrible language. All point with unfaltering finger to death, yes to death eternal, as the wages due to sin. But it is useless to seek in external nature, an analogy for the Nightmare Life-in-Death, "who thicks man's blood with cold." It is not to be found. Indeed the ultimate absorption, by death temporal, of all that ever live in this world, renders it impossible to find a parallel case. All Butler's analogies for the future state of the wicked, point either to finite punishment or eternal death. None of them touch the conception of infinity. And, expand the finite as you please, *the difference between the finite and the infinite will still be infinite itself.*[1]

And thus, in spite of the inexorable sternness of the code which binds the elements of the world, we can hold to our faith that God is love, and that love is the grand, unalterable law of his creation—

> "Though nature, red in tooth and claw
> With rapine, shrieks against the creed."

Though the blazing bolt of the wrath of God was not lifted at the *Auto da Fe*, the crusades of De Montfort, or the noyades of Carrier: though he, whose breath could have withered the destroyer in a moment, gave no external help to those who cried to him, we doubt not that he pitied them; we still look forward in hope for the day which shall end all sorrow—a day "for whose bright dawn the whole creation groans." But this is only because we are not so bad as part of our creed. We do not really think as hardly of God as our ecclesiastical formulas would teach us. When we praise him, bless him, glorify him, and give thanks to him for his great glory, we lay aside, for the moment, our belief in the sentence of eternal fire thundered forth against our fellow-men.

And yet, most of us give assent, at least verbal assent, to propositions which, if true, would represent this world as infinitely

[1] It is positively marvellous how an able mathematician can manage, when he turns to theology, to overlook this fact.

worse than a huge and hideous charnel house; which, if truly believed, and at all realized in the imagination, ought, as Mr. Maurice says, to drive us mad, and would surely separate the two sexes in monasteries and nunneries, so that, at all events, the accursed race should increase no more.

For, if it be indeed our destiny, as blazing beacons, shining horribly through all eternity, to mark for the dwellers of the stars of heaven each turning from the ways of God, the hearts of those much favored beings must be harder than the adamant itself, if the heap of misery already accumulated, is not sufficient for their warning, and will not confirm them in their blissful lives, beyond all fear of change.' For us—

> "so steep'd in misery,
> Surely 'twere better not to be."

I have now brought to a conclusion my remarks on the doctrine of eternal punishment, considered as a question of ethics; and, also, my examination of the arguments of its supporters, considered in reference to the same science. Mr. Froude remarks: "I know but one man, of more than miserable intellect, who in these modern times has dared defend eternal punishment on the score of *justice*, and that is Leibnitz; a man who, if I know him rightly, chose the subject from its difficulty as an opportunity for the display of his genius, and cared so little for the truth that his conclusions did not cost his heart a single pang." It is manifest, from the distinguished names connected with the arguments I have been discussing, that we cannot now say that this doctrine is undefended by at least a few able men. Still, notwithstanding all their ability and zeal, I think it has been made clear that their arguments are based upon principles which would reverse all ethical science. How *such men* could have ever brought themselves to make use of *such arguments*, is to the present writer an insoluble enigma.[1]

And we must not forget that, in their case, the common rule that a refuted argument *ought to go for nothing*, does not apply. That rule is only valid when the employer of the fallacious reasoning is either incompetent or ignorant, and then it may be fairly urged that his weak arguments should not be considered detrimental to his cause, inasmuch as an abler and and better informed man might very possibly produce more cogent reasons in support of the proposition, whatever it may be. *But the case is altogether different when the arguments of able and well-informed men, who zealously endeavor to establish a certain proposition, are shown to be untenable; this very refutation becomes at once a strong positive argument against their position; for, if such men as these can produce nothing better in support of their theory, it is not likely that much can be said by any one in its behalf.*

[1] It is well to bear in mind that the whole of this most immoral theory of the eternal torture of A *for the benefit of B*, is a pure invention of the defenders of eternal punishment. There is not the smallest shadow of evidence for it, beyond their bare assertion.

[2] "All the attempts yet made to reconcile the doctrine with divine justice and mercy are calculated to make us blush alike for the human heart that can strive to justify such a creed, and for the human intellect which can delude itself into a belief that it has succeeded in such justification."—Greg. *The Creed of Christendom*, p. 202. This is a statement of a writer whose views are in a very high degree harsh and stern.

PREACHING TO SPIRITS IN PRISON.

Peter, in his First Epistle, written A. D. 67, and addressed to the (Jewish) Christians of Asia-Minor, says in ch. 3: 18, 19, according to the Common Version, 'For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah,' etc. Romanists, with a large number of the early fathers, and Dean Alford among modern critics, understand this literally. The latter says, in his Greek Testament (1862, vol. 4, p. 388), 'I understand these words to say, that our Lord, in his disembodied state, did go to the place of detention of departed spirits, and did there announce his work of redemption, preach salvation in fact to the disembodied spirits of those who refused to obey the voice of God when the judgment of the flood was hanging over them.'

To find the true meaning of this passage three questions must be discussed—(1) *How* did he preach? (2) *To whom* did he preach? (3) *When* did he preach?

I. *How did he preach?* was it personally or spiritually? The common version apparently understands that the spirit by which he was quickened was the Holy Spirit, but the antithesis forbids it: *lit.* it is 'put to death as to flesh, but made living as to spirit, in which [spirit] having gone on, he went and preached.' Now the phrase 'went and preached' is a common Hebrew and Bible idiom, meaning simply 'he preached.' (Verbs of posture and gesture, *e. g.* 'to go, sit, stand, walk,' are often — 'to be,' see Acts 9: 7, and comp. 26: 4.) Eph. 2: 14–17 is a striking parallel: Christ 'came and preached peace to you.' Did he go to Ephesus and preach in *person*, or in *spirit*, by his ministers? Will Dean Alford explain why Eph. 2: 14–17 must be spiritualized, and 1 Pet. 3: 18, 19, considered literal?

II. *To whom did he preach?* The common version says 'to the spirits in prison,' but the Greek word here used means also a '*watch* or *guard*,' as in Rev. 18: 2 (compared with Hab. 2: 1; Is. 34: 11; Jer. 50: 39; 51: 37); Luke 12: 38, etc., and so many interpreters understand it of the eight persons of Noah's family being, as it were, in a 'watch-tower,' waiting for direction from the Lord. The clause 'which sometime were disobedient' is parenthetical, descriptive of the state of Noah's family *before* they were warned of God regarding the coming of the flood.

If the rendering 'in *prison*' be preferred, it may and will naturally mean the prison of sin in this life, as in Is. 61: 1, 'the opening of the *prison* to them that are bound.'

III. *When did he preach?* The punctuation of the common version would lead the reader to connect the word *when* with the term *disobedient*, but it *should*, or at least *may*, most legitimately be connected with the word *preach*, *i. e.* he went and preached when once the long suffering of God waited, etc., the clause 'which sometime were disobedient' being a parenthesis, as already noted.

The notion of the disembodied spirit of Christ going to preach to other disembodied spirits, who were detained in purgatory, or hell, is so utterly unsupported by the general tenor of Scripture teaching regarding the dead (in that they are beyond the reach of change), that we might well pause before adopting it, and do so only on the safest and soundest argument, instead of which it rests on a most superficial basis, the *mis*translations and *mis*punctuations of the English Version! Christ's going thither could only have one of two objects, either to make them *better*, or to make them *worse*. We see nothing in Scripture to support the one, and very much to condemn the other. Yet it was very commonly, perhaps we might almost say universally, held by the Christian fathers of the first four centuries, that Christ brought back many out of hell with him. But blessed be God, our faith does not rest on these men—Synods and Councils and Churches have erred—but on the foundation laid by the apostles and prophets (*i. e.* the apostolic prophets), Jesus the Christ being its chief corner stone.—*Edinburg Biblical Notes and Queries.*

BOOK NOTICE.

A CRITICAL GREEK AND ENGLISH CONCORDANCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Prepared by Charles F. Hudson, under the direction of H. L. Hastings. Revised and completed by Ezra Abbot, LL.D., of Harvard University. Boston, 1870. Pp. 582.

It is with pleasure that we greet this new and valuable contribution to the theological literature of America. The seven years task has at last been most happily completed. The work in many respects surpasses any other of the kind that has ever appeared. It embraces all the various readings derived from the most ancient and valuable manuscripts, as embodied in the Greek New Testaments of GRIESBACH, LACHMANN, TISCHENDORF, and TREGELLES. It contains an index of English words, by means of which one entirely unacquainted with the Greek, can find the original for any English word in any passage of the New Testament. Its convenient size, clear arrangement, and vast amount of digested study, make it peculiarly valuable as a book of reference. All persons engaged in theological studies, especially every minister, whether he be a classical scholar or not, should have a copy of this unique and incomparable Greek and English Concordance.

J. H. W.

Price, $2.50. For sale at the office of THE QUARTERLY.

THE

Advent Christian Quarterly.

VOL. II.—APRIL, 1871.—NO. IV.

"THE MAN OF SIN."

("That day shall not come) unless there come the apostasy first, and there have been revealed the man of sin, the son of perdition, he that withstands, and exalts himself above every one that is called god, or an object of adoration, so that he sits in the temple of God showing himself that he is God."—2 Thes. 2: 3, 4, Dean Alford's Version.

Many modern writers and teachers propose to find "the man of sin" in the future, and contend that the prophecy of Paul is not to be interpreted as describing and threatening the Papal system, or as Gibbon aptly phrases it, "the sacerdotal monarchy." Some of them admit that the Romish system has been a very wicked thing, and that in some general way the prophecy has pointed to it, but "the man of sin," it is contended, is some unique monster of iniquity not yet revealed, who, in arrogant self-exaltation, and enormous wickedness, shall distance all the scourges of mankind that have appeared in the history of the world. And as he is to be successful in his course of iniquity, as he is to be the great opponent and persecutor of Christ and his people, and as during his session terrible judgments, threatened in God's Word, are to come on a large portion of the human family, a time of unparalleled tribulation must, in that case, be before us.

Roman Catholics very naturally reject an interpretation that implicates their own church, and they who are looking Romeward of course sympathize with them; but besides these two classes (if they be two classes), not a few German and Eng-

lish expositors (the latter apparently often influenced by the former) entertain a strong conviction, that insuperable difficulties lie in the way of finding a fulfillment of the prophecy in the history of the Apostate Church.

Another class, earnest thinkers many of them, and leaders of public opinion, eschew largely the consideration of prophecy in general, and this prophecy in particular, who yet have some undefined notions that there are difficulties in the way of applying the prediction to the Papacy, and find a relief in assigning its fulfillment to the future; while a few advanced men very summarily dismiss the subject with a few emphatic words. "Old fashioned views," "exploded long ago," &c. But surely a prophecy so remarkable in itself, a prophecy which influences the meaning of a large portion of the Bible, and which has an important bearing on the prospects of both the Church and the world, is worthy of a very thoughtful consideration. The writer has a decided conviction that the prophecy was to have its accomplishment in the rise, the development, and the destruction of the Papal dominion, and that by a fair exegesis, without accommodation or constraint, all the objections urged against such an interpretation can be removed.

Before these objections are considered, it will be necessary to trace the resemblance which the historic picture bears to the prophetic sketch, and which in itself is an argument. For unless there be insuperable objections, a likeness so striking, and to be traced through all the past, from the time when the mystery of iniquity was working until now, demands to be the fulfillment of the prediction. This seems to have been felt by some expositors who look for the revelation of "the man of sin" in the future. Dean Alford for instance admits certain remarkable resemblances, which he calls "striking coincidences," but falls back on a future revelation of the lawless (one), because some parts of the description, as he thinks, never can be fulfilled in the Pope. Others find in the "Apostasy of Romanism one of the greatest instances of the working of the mystery of iniquity," but think the Apostasy and the Antichrist are not found there. It is but "a forerunner of the final concentration of blasphemy in 'the man of sin.'" The resemblances are,

however, too striking and too exact to be mere coincidences. Even in its early circumstances before the system reached maturity, a resemblance is traceable. The mystery of iniquity, Paul said, was working and was to grow into an apostasy, otherwise called, "a departure from the faith." These were to prelude the revelation of the "man of sin." There was also in existence a double check, a hindrance, and a hinderer, which for some time were to impede the growth of this development of evil. Here was the prediction, and we find the facts to correspond. There was the growth of error and worldliness in the degenerating Church, and an aiming after greatness and power by the heads of the Apostasy, but the full assumption of power was hindered. There was that which withheld, "the moral and conservative power of political States," says Olshausen. There was "he that letteth," or hindereth; "those," says Alford, "who rule this policy." The Roman empire, and the Roman emperors, would well answer these descriptions. There came a time when the empire declined, and the emperors lost power. The hindrance then became weakened, and much of the lost power was gathered up by the head of the Apostasy. "Like Thebes or Babylon or Carthage," says Gibbon, "the name of Rome might have been erased from the earth, if the city had not been animated by a vital principle which again restored her to honor and dominion." The "temporal power of the popes insensibly arose from the calamities of the times." (*Pontificate of Gregory the Great*, A. D. 590—604.) "The misfortunes of Rome involved the apostolical pastor in the business of peace and war, and it might be doubtful to himself whether piety or ambition prompted him to supply the place of his absent sovereign." (Ch. 45.) The hinderer and the hindrance are being removed, and there begins the revelation of that revived Roman power, half ecclesiastical, half political, which in after times made kings as vassals, and shed the blood of the saints. Surely Paul's prophecy and succeeding events remarkably correspond.

The next point in the resemblance is the moral character of the antichrist was to arise, and the Apostle has made this character so prominent, so many sided, and yet so original, that when developed, the identity ought to be at once recognized.

lish expositors (the latter apparently often influenced by the former) entertain a strong conviction, that insuperable difficulties lie in the way of finding a fulfillment of the prophecy in the history of the Apostate Church.

Another class, earnest thinkers many of them, and leaders of public opinion, eschew largely the consideration of prophecy in general, and this prophecy in particular, who yet have some undefined notions that there are difficulties in the way of applying the prediction to the Papacy, and find a relief in assigning its fulfillment to the future; while a few advanced men very summarily dismiss the subject with a few emphatic words. "Old fashioned views," "exploded long ago," &c. But surely a prophecy so remarkable in itself, a prophecy which influences the meaning of a large portion of the Bible, and which has an important bearing on the prospects of both the Church and the world, is worthy of a very thoughtful consideration. The writer has a decided conviction that the prophecy was to have its accomplishment in the rise, the development, and the destruction of the Papal dominion, and that by a fair exegesis, without accommodation or constraint, all the objections urged against such an interpretation can be removed.

Before these objections are considered, it will be necessary to trace the resemblance which the historic picture bears to the prophetic sketch, and which in itself is an argument. For unless there be insuperable objections, a likeness so striking, and to be traced through all the past, from the time when the mystery of iniquity was working until now, demands to be the fulfillment of the prediction. This seems to have been felt by some expositors who look for the revelation of "the man of sin" in the future. Dean Alford for instance admits certain remarkable resemblances, which he calls "striking coincidences," but falls back on a future revelation of the lawless (one), because some parts of the description, as he thinks, never can be fulfilled in the Pope. Others find in the "Apostasy of Romanism one of the greatest instances of the working of the mystery of iniquity," but think the Apostasy and the Antichrist are not found there. It is but "a forerunner of the final concentration of blasphemy in 'the man of sin.'" The resemblances are,

however, too striking and too exact to be mere coincidences. Even in its early circumstances before the system reached maturity, a resemblance is traceable. The mystery of iniquity, Paul said, was working and was to grow into an apostasy, otherwise called, "a departure from the faith." These were to prelude the revelation of the "man of sin." There was also in existence a double check, a hindrance, and a hinderer, which for some time were to impede the growth of this development of evil. Here was the prediction, and we find the facts to correspond. There was the growth of error and worldliness in the degenerating Church, and an aiming after greatness and power by the heads of the Apostasy, but the full assumption of power was hindered. There was that which withheld, "the moral and conservative power of political States," says Olshausen. There was "he that letteth," or hindereth; "those," says Alford, "who rule this policy." The Roman empire, and the Roman emperors, would well answer these descriptions. There came a time when the empire declined, and the emperors lost power. The hindrance then became weakened, and much of the lost power was gathered up by the head of the Apostasy. "Like Thebes or Babylon or Carthage," says Gibbon, "the name of Rome might have been erased from the earth, if the city had not been animated by a vital principle which again restored her to honor and dominion." The "temporal power of the popes insensibly arose from the calamities of the times." (*Pontificate of Gregory the Great*, A. D. 590—604.) "The misfortunes of Rome involved the apostolical pastor in the business of peace and war, and it might be doubtful to himself whether piety or ambition prompted him to supply the place of his absent sovereign." (Ch. 45.) The hinderer and the hindrance are being removed, and there begins the revelation of that revived Roman power, half ecclesiastical, half political, which in after times made kings as vassals, and shed the blood of the saints. Surely Paul's prophecy and succeeding events remarkably correspond.

The next point in the resemblance is the moral character of the antichrist was to arise, and the Apostle has made this character so prominent, so many sided, and yet so original, that when developed, the identity ought to be at once recognized.

He is "the man of sin," pre-eminently marked by sin. He is "that wicked," or lawless (one) who would trample on all existing institutions and rules of conduct, and be a law unto himself. He is also "the son of perdition," a name evidently descriptive of moral character, borrowed from a disgraced disciple, who while a professed follower of Christ, was a thief and betrayed his Master. "Son of perdition" would no doubt point on to the destruction threatened, but it was evidently intended to indicate the Judas-like character which the man of sin was to bear. His presence, too, was to be with "all deceit of unrighteousness." A few quotations only from the mass of evidence that offers itself can be made, and these will be extracted almost entirely from the writings of Roman Catholics.

"The lives of the Roman hierarchs of the middle and succeeding ages displayed all the variations of impiety, malevolence, inhumanity, ambition, debauchery, gluttony, sensuality, deism, and atheism." Platina calls the pontiffs of the tenth century "monsters." "Fifty popes," says Genebrard, "in 150 years, from John the Eighth, entirely degenerated from the sanctity of their ancestors, and were apostatical rather than apostolical."—Geneb. 4; Platina, 128.

Baronius, in his annals of the tenth century, says, "Many shocking monsters intruded into the pontifical chair, who were guilty of robbery, assassination, simony, dissipation, tyranny, sacrilege, perjury, and all kinds of miscreancy. Both cardinals, bishops, priests, and secular clergy emulated the crimes of the pontiffs. The houses of the clergy were schools for harlots and assemblies of stage-players, where dice, dancing, and singing were to be witnessed, and where the patrimony of kings and the alms given by princes were lavishly squandered. At that time how deformed, how frightful was the face of the Church of Rome! The holy see was fallen under the tyranny of two loose and disorderly women, who....placed their gallants upon St. Peter's chair....All the canons of councils were infringed, the decrees of popes trampled under foot, the ancient traditions despised.. and the holy see became a prey to avarice and ambition."—Spon. 900, 1; 908, 3; Baronius; Du Pin, Hist. Tenth Cent.

"Roman immorality," says Gerbert, "was at this time the horror of the world."

John the Twelfth drank a health to the devil, and invoked Jupiter and Venus. "John," says Bellarmin, "was nearly the wickedest of the popes." (2:20.) Boniface the Eighth was accused by Nogaret and Du Plesis with having been guilty of the greatest crimes. He "represented the gospel as a medley of truth and falsehood, and denied the doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the immortality of the soul. The soul of man," he affirmed, "was the same as a beast's, and he believed no more in the Virgin Mary than in an ass, nor in her Son than in the foal of an ass."—Brug, Du Pin, Alexand. and Bossuet, quoted from Professor Edgar's Variations of Popery.

The iniquity of this revelation of sin was seen, not only in the immoral lives of those who represented the Apostate Church, but in their deceit and cruelty in persecuting the Church of God.

"Heretics," says Aquinas, "may not only be excommunicated but justly killed" (2:2; 3:48). Urban II. decided "that the person who, inflamed with zeal for Catholicism, should slay any of the excommunicated, was not guilty of murder."—Brug, 2:508.

"Kings were to be solicited, and if necessary compelled by ecclesiastical censures to exterminate all heretics from their dominions. The sovereign who should refuse was to be excommunicated."—Variations of Popery, pp. 244, 247.

"Lavour was taken by storm in 1211....all the citizens were mangled in promiscuous carnage. Four hundred were burned alive....The soldiery in the morning attended high mass, and then proceeded to waste the country and murder the inhabitants."—Alexand. Daniel, 252, 253.

"He who owes anything to a heretic, by means of purchase, promise, exchange, loan, or any other contract, is not bound to keep his promise, bargain, or contract, even though sworn, to a heretic."—Lord's Maynooth, p. 82.

"It is an act of kindness to obstinate heretics to take them out of this life; for the longer they live the more errors they invent, the more men do they pervert, and the greater damnation do they acquire to themselves."—Bellarmin, quoted Lord's Maynooth, p. 102.

"If, indeed, it can be done, they are undoubtedly to be extirpated: but if this cannot, either because they are not sufficiently known, and there is danger lest the innocent should suffer for the guilty, or if they are stronger than we are, and there is danger if we attack them in war that more of us would fall than them, then we are to keep quiet."—Lord's Maynooth, p. 103.

The editor of the French paper, the Univers, says: "I avow frankly my regret that John Huss was not burned sooner than he was, and that Luther was not burned also in the same way. I regret that a prince was not found sufficiently pious and politic to excite a general crusade against the Protestants."—Evan's Mother Popery, p. 208.

The Archbishop of St. Louis says: "Catholicism endures it (Protestantism) when and where she must; but she hates it, and directs all her energies to effect its destruction. If the Catholics ever gain, which they surely will do, an irresistible numerical majority, religious freedom in this country is at an end."

Bishop O'Connor, of Pittsburg, says: "Religious liberty is merely endured until the opposite can be carried into execution without peril to the Catholic world."—See New York Recorder, March, 1853.

Here are some of the deeds of "the man of sin." As "the lawless" (one) his doings are equally manifest. If the testimony of history had been made to fit the prophecy, the resemblance could not have been more exact.

According to Cardinal Zabarella, "the pontiffs assumed the accomplishment of all they pleased, even unlawful things." The Canon Law declares that "the Pope in the plenitude of his power, is above all right, can change the substantial nature of things, and transform unlawful into lawful." Bellarmin affirms that "the Pope can transubstantiate sin into duty, and duty into sin." (Zabarel de Schism Thuan, c. 397; Durand, 1:50; Bellarmin, 4:5.) He can, says the Canon Law, "dispense with right."—Decreti. Greg. 3:8.

"If the Pope should become neglectful of his own salvation and draw drove with him innumerable people into hell; yet no mortal man may presume to reprehend him, forasmuch as he is judge of all, and is judged of no one."—Decreti, Part 1, dis. 4, can. 6.

"The Bishop of Rome has power to absolve from all allegiance, obligation, bond of service, promise, and compact, the provinces, cities, and armies of kings that rebel against him, and also to loose their vassals and feudatories."—Clementi, lib. 2; lit. 1; c. 2.

"The tribunals of kings are subjected to the power of the priests." "The temporal power can neither loose nor bind the Pope." "The Bishop of Rome may be judged of none but of God only."—Camp, p. 240.

"Not bound by any law" was the proud boast of Pope Leo in the ninth century.—Baronius.

We have here the lawless one. "This wicked" is also the betrayer of Christ; whose presence too is with signs and wonders, and all deceit of unrighteousness for them that perish.

St. Bernard, speaking of the clergy generally, says, they "are called pastors, but in reality are plunderers, who, unsatisfied with the fleece, thirst for the blood of the flock, and merit the appellation not of shepherds but of traitors." "The faithful reproach, scourges, nails, spear, and cross; all these his ministers who serve Antichrist melt in the furnace of covetousness, and expend on the acquisition of filthy gain, differing from Judas only in the magnitude of the sum for which they sell their Master."—Bernard, 1750—1759.

"Pope Innocent first sent a missionary expedition against the Albigenses. His holiness, for this purpose, commissioned Raiser, Guy, Arnold, Galdin, [illegible]

Castelnau, Rodolf, and Dominic. These, in the execution of their mission, preached Popery and wrought miracles."—Benedict, 1: 50.

A large number of miracles said to be performed by the Popes or others may be found in the Roman Breviary from pages 385—737.

Aquinas advised a "Catholic, notwithstanding his plighted faith or oath, to betray an obstinate heretic to the judges." Gregory in 1080 asserted his authority to dissolve the oath of fealty."—Variations of Popery, p. 271, 287.

Liguori says, "It is a certain and a common opinion amongst all divines, that for a just cause it is lawful to use equivocation in the propounded modes, and to confirm it (equivocation) with an oath."

"What if it would exceedingly grieve a very honorable man to beg or to labor, whether he can provide for himself out of another's property?"

"Salmant, etc., deny it, but Viva, etc., answer in the affirmative, and this appears to me the more probable if his shame be so great that he would prefer death itself to begging."—Moral Theology of Liguori.

"It is asked, is it lawful to swear anything false? adding in a low voice, a true circumstance. Hurtado and Prado say that it is, for in order that what is said to be true, it is enough that it outwardly agrees with the conceit in the mind, whether it is expressed by nods or whispers, and it be PER ACCIDENS that the other does not hear it. The Salmaticenses explain it better, allowing it, provided in any way the whispers could be heard by the other, though the meaning of it could not be detected."—Liug. 4: 168.

It were needless to give instances of winking Madonnas, sweating images of the Savior, holy garments with miraculous powers, etc., as deceptions of this kind will present themselves to every mind. Beyond the lawlessness and deceit which were to mark "the man of sin," he was to be an arrogant usurper, an opposer of God and righteousness. "He opposeth," is an adversary, withstands Christ and his cause. "He exalts himself above all that is called God." He "sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Can there be found in the history of the Papacy a likeness to this remarkable description given of "the man of sin?"

Bernard affirms that "none except God is like the Pope either on earth or in heaven."—Bernard, 1725.

"The Pope," according to Lainez at the Council of Trent, "has the power of dispensing with all laws, and the same authority as the Lord."—Variations of Popery, p. 160.

"The Pontiff," say Jacobatius and Durand, "possesses a plenitude of power, and none dare say to him any more than to God, Lord, what doest thou?"

Marcellus, in the Lateran Council, and with its full approbation, called Julius "God on earth."—Variations of Popery, p. 160.

"The Emperor Constantine," says Nicholas the First, "conferred the appellation of God on the Pope, who therefore being God cannot be judged by man."

An archbishop in the last same Lateran Synod called Julius "Prince of the World," and another orator styled Leo, "the possessor of all power in heaven and in earth, who presided over all the kingdoms of the globe." This blasphemy the Pontiff heard with unmingled complacency.—Variations of Popery, p. 161.

Bellarmin affirms that "the Pope can transubstantiate sin into duty and duty into sin."—Bellarmin, 4: 5.

Stephen, Archbishop of Petraca, declared in the Council of Lateran, that Leo possessed "power above all powers, both in heaven and in earth."—Labbeus, 19: 624.

Pope Innocent Third, writing to the Bishop of Nantz, said, "The vicegerent of the true God, the Pope, even changes the nature of things, and may make something out of nothing; he can do these things because his will stands for reason, for he can dispense with holy laws, and can also convert righteousness into unrighteousness by converting and changing ordinances."

The same Pope decreed, "We, who according to the plenitude of our power, have a right to dispense above all law or right." He is, "Our Lord God the Pope; another God upon earth; King of kings, and Lord of lords. The same is the dominion of God and the Pope. To believe that our Lord God the Pope might not decree as he decreed, were a matter of heresy. The power of the Pope is greater than all created power, and extends itself to things celestial, terrestrial, and infernal. The Pope doeth whatsoever he listeth, even things unlawful, and is more than God."—Bishop Newton's Proph. 2, p. 309; Apud Sewel's Defence; Barrow's Supremacy.

"The eyes of the nations are fixed on our humility," wrote Gregory II. to the Emperor, A. D. 727, "and they revere as a God upon earth the Apostle St. Peter, whose image you threaten to destroy. The remote and interior kingdoms of the West present their homage to Christ and his vicegerent."—Ellicott in Critical English Test. on Rev. 13: 1.

"The Pope," (for instance Clement VI.) "in his bull concerning the jubilee, ordered the angels of Paradise to admit into its glories the souls of those who died on the journey, as being entirely freed from purgatory."—Critical English Testament, 2 Thes. 2: 4.

"When Leo X. was moving in a procession to St. John a few years before the Reformation, the multitude fell on their knees to receive his benediction. Amongst the decorations on the triumphal arches, etc., he is depicted as in Christ's place, while the inscription to one of the devices was, 'A god wonderful among his saints.'"—Elliott's Horæ Apocalypticæ.

"We wait with open arms the return of those wandering sons to the Catholic church in order that we may be able to receive them with all affection into the dwelling of the celestial Father, and make them participators in his everlasting treasures."—Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius IX. to Protestant Bishops, 1868.[1]

These few extracts will be sufficient to show that the representatives of the apostate church have made themselves equal with God, and have thereby exalted themselves above all that is called God or is worshipped; and if any think the Apostle meant that they were to exalt themselves above the true God, they may find more than one sense in which that arrogant assumption is true. He who vaults into the seat of God, and sets himself above all law; he who releases men from what God requires, and requires what God has not asked; he who claims to have power over things celestial, and infernal, who will even order the angels to obey his commands in the spiritual world, so far certainly exalts himself above God.

Now the very remarkable resemblance that we have traced between the prophecy in the Thessalonians and the historic picture, proves, we think, that the one is the fulfillment of the other, unless there be insuperable objections. Paul tells us that the mystery of iniquity was working in his day, and that certain hindrances stood in the way of the full development of the Apostacy. Eighteen centuries have gone by since then, during which, on the hypothesis of the futurist, both the hindrance and the hinderer have lived on, and the revelation of evil which

[1] Beside the above testimony, the following possesses additional interest and weight. A little more than two years since the present Pope declared: "I alone... am the successor of the apostles, the vicar of Jesus Christ: I alone have the mission to guide and direct the bark of St. Peter; I AM THE WAY, THE TRUTH, AND THE LIFE. They who are with me, are with the church; they who are not with me are out of the church—they are out of the way, the truth, and the life." The action of the late Council of the Vatican in proclaiming the Pope infallible, with which all are familiar, is a fitting culmination of such blasphemy as is quoted above.

they checked has not yet been manifested. But more than this, there did come into existence a system of iniquity with its headship, which, as we have seen, has borne a wonderful likeness to the description of the prophecy, yet we must pass it by, and look for the fulfillment in the future. Dean Alford calls these resemblances, "striking coincidences," by which he means, we suppose, that the two things happened to be strikingly alike, for he holds that "the man of sin" is yet to come. But if so, we have the most marvellous series of coincidences that ever happened in the history of the world. That a priest and a Levite should chance to be passing in the way between Jerusalem and Jericho, when the traveler fell among thieves, is no matter of surprise; but that in a prophecy so full and particular in its description, and so original in its features, there should be correspondences so exact and so many, occupying many centuries, and yet there should be no designed resemblance, and no fulfillment, but that it only fell out so, would be a marvel indeed.

But then it is alleged that there are difficulties that positively forbid the application of the prophecy to the Papacy—that there are descriptions of "the man of sin," which never have been and never can be fulfilled in the Pope, and if so we must seek another application of Paul's prediction, and can only wonder that two things having no intended resemblance, should happen to be so strikingly alike. These objections it is proposed to examine.

The views held by futurists are not all of the same type, but they all agree that the Apostle's strong language, especially in the third and fourth verses, must point to some future antichrist who shall embody in his own wicked self all the evils that can inhere in our depraved human nature.

Auberlen says, "Antichristian tendencies produce different antichrists; these separate antichrists shall hereafter find their consummation in an individual exceeding them all in the intensity of his evil character." According to this scheme there has been no one development of evil that could bear the likeness of Paul's "man of sin," we have had only "different antichrists" of various shapes and characters growing out of "antichristian tendencies."

Olshausen approaches this view. He says, "The various prefigurations of Antichrist, Mahomet, Rome, Napoleon, and modern Secularism, contain only some, not all, his characteristics. It is the union of all in some one person that shall form the full Antichrist."

Mahomet, Rome, Napoleon, and Secularism present such variety in their characteristics that they could not each and all answer to the one portrait that Paul has drawn. Under the hand of Olshausen, too, the future grows terribly threatening in its aspect. If "the full Antichrist" is to appear, embodying in himself the ambition, the violence, the lust, the infidelity and blasphemy represented by Mahomet, Rome, Napoleon, and Secularism, then wo to some future inhabitants of the earth. The

sickening evils of ages past are but the shadow of what is to come.

"In the characteristic of v. 4," says Dean Alford, "the Pope does not and never did fulfill the prophecy. Allowing all the striking coincidences with the latter part of the verse which have been so abundantly adduced, it never can be shown that he fulfills the former part, nay, so far is he from it that the abject adoration of and submission to *legomena theoi* (those called gods) and *sebasmata* (things worshipped) has ever been one of his notable characteristics." "According then to this view, we will look for the man of sin, in the fulness of the prophetic sense, to appear, and that immediately before the coming of the Lord."—Proleg. vol. 3, pp. 66, 67.

The Rev. Robert Govett, M. A., an earnest advocate of futurist views, writes, "I would be content to peril the whole argument in a plain English yes or no to the questions: 1. Do the Popes exalt themselves as superior in godhead to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? 2. Do they oppose themselves to the worship of Peter, Mary, Joseph, and the glorified saints: 3. Do they exalt themselves above Peter, Mary, and the glorified saints?"

The principal objections assume the following forms:

I. The popes do not oppose themselves to "all that is called God, or that is worshipped," therefore they are not "the man of sin."

To many minds this has appeared an insurmountable difficulty. Does not the Church of Rome, it is asked, worship saints and angels, and other objects of their veneration, and how then could Paul say that the pontiffs, the heads and representatives of that church, would oppose themselves to all that is called God, or is worshipped, seeing they both encourage and practice such worship? "So far," says a modern writer, "is Romanism from opposing all that is called God, that adoration of gods and lords many is a leading feature in it." The simple reply to this objection is, that Paul does not say "the man of sin" *would* oppose himself to all that is called God, but that he would exalt himself *above* all these objects of worship. Some writers, indeed, have so construed his words. They render, "who opposeth himself to, and exalteth himself above, all that is called God;" but that is their interpretation, what they think the words should say, not what they do say. That "the man of sin" was to oppose, there can be no doubt, for Paul says so—that worship of angels, and Peter, and Mary, and other saints must, if they know it, be very much opposed to their feelings, cannot be questioned; they would say "See that ye do it not;" but in this prophecy the apostle says nothing about opposing saints and angels or any other objects of worship; the opposition is to the Lord and his church. The first member of the sentence (v. 4) gives a complete sense, "who opposeth;" who, or what, he opposes we have to learn from his name, and character, and position. He is the Antichrist, the opponent of God, his cause, and his people; and here will be indicated the direction his opposition will take. He is not revealed as the opponent of false worship; we should rather conclude that he would

be on the side of that which dishonors God. Satan, who is to lend his inspiration, has always loved to draw off the hearts of men from the love and worship of God by presenting rival objects. The sense of "opposeth" is not carried on to "all that is called God," but is used absolutely. Robinson (*Lex.*) says, "'*antikeimai*..... in N. T. *to oppose, be* adverse, so *'o antikeimenos, an adversary,* opposer. absol. (Lk. 13 : 17; 21: 15; 1 Cor. 16 : 9; Phil. 1 : 28; 2 Thes. 2 : 4; 1 Tim. 5 : 14)." The The early translators give this absolute sense to the word in their renderings.

Wiclif translates "the sonne perdicioun that is adversarie and is exhaunsed over all that is said God or that is worshipped."

"The sonne of perdecion which is an adversarie and is exalted above all that is called god," etc.—Tyndale.

"The sonne of perdicyon which is an adversarie and is exalted above," etc.—Cranmer.

"The sonne I say of perdition which is an adversarie, and is exalted above," etc.—Geneva Vers.

"The sonne of perdition which is an adversarie and is exalted above."—Rheims. Vers.

Dean Alford renders, "The Man of Sin, the son of perdition, he that withstands [the construction must not be carried on as if every one called God, *epi panta k. t. l.*] belonged to *antikeimenos* [he that withstands] as well as to *uperaromenos* [exalteth himself, etc.], but *antikeimenos* is absolute, he that withstands Christ, the *antichristos* [1 John 2 : 18], and exalts himself above [in a hostile sense] every one that is called God."—Greek Test. in loc.

Ellicott says, "The versions rightly recognise the substantival character of *o ant k-imenos* [he that opposeth, the adversary] and unite *epi panta k. t. l.* solely with the following participle."—Com. 7, pp. 109, 161.

The same sense is given in our English version by simply adding the comma after "opposeth." As, "who opposeth, and exalteth himself above," etc. There is no proof that the opposition of the adversary he that opposeth, is to be carried on to the inferior objects of worship: it is an opposition to the Lord and his Christ.

And as the sense of opposition is not carried on to the remaining words of the sentence, "all that is called God," etc., so neither is it found *in* those words. The almost universal rendering is "above" or "over" all that is called God. Tyndale, Cranmer, the Geneva and Rheims Versions, Coverdale, the Authorized Version 1611, Macknight, Jowett, and Alford, render "above," Wiclif translates "*over*."[1]

[1] Alford renders, "Exalteth himself above all that is called God," etc., but in a parenthesis adds ("in a hostile sense.") Ellicott, in his English translation, has rendered "against," conveying the sense of opposition to these inferior objects of worship, but in his exposition of the Greek text renders ("who) exalteth himself above (and against,") "against" being put parenthetically. This sense of hostility seems supposed to be given by the word *epi*, which enters into the construction of this phrase. Ellicott says, "The general local meaning of *epi*, viz.: motion with a view to superposition, involves the more specific and ethical one of opposition" (Com. p. 110). So it has not here its primary meaning of "on," or "upon," or its general sense of motion to place above something else, but a specific and ethical one. And it must get this specific ethical meaning, not from the word itself, but from the bearing of this adversary towards these objects of worship. There are a few passages in Scripture where our translators have rendered *epi* "against." To one of these passages, Mat. 10: 21, Ellicott has referred. As this is the only word from

The testimony of the prophecy then is, that "the man of sin" would be an opposer of God, an adversary, the Antichrist; and that he would exalt himself above all that is called god. These two things, *against* God, *above* all that is called god.

Daniel, in his prophecy concerning this same power, confirms this view. A "little horn" sprang up on the head of a terrible beast which he saw in his vision. This horn had "eyes like a man, and a mouth speaking great things." (ch. 7 : 6, 20.) The "great things" spoken of by this power are "*against the most High.*" They are not words uttered against the things called god, but against the great God himself (v. 25.)

In another prediction, which most futurists understand as directly, or by type, describing "the man of sin," he says, "He shall exalt himself and magnify himself *above* every god, and shall speak marvellous things *against* the God of gods." Here, in words very similar to those of Paul, a distinction is made between the God of gods, and the things that are worshipped. The haughty invader of God's house and God's people, exalts and greatens himself *above* every god, but speaks marvellous things *against* the God of gods.

All the testimony goes to show that Paul does not say "the

which even the semblance of evidence could be obtained for showing that "the man of sin" was to oppose the inferior objects of worship, it may be as well to examine them and see if they will support this view. I believe I have found every passage in the New Testament where *epi* is translated "against," and in every case the sense of hostility is found, not in the word, but in the subject. The sense is communicated not from the word to the subject, but from the subject to the word. An examination of them will show this distinction to be correct. The first of these passages, and the one to which special reference has been made, is—Mat. 10 : 21, with Mark 13 : 12; Luke 12 : 52, 53—"Children shall rise up against [*epi*] their parents and cause them to be put to death." The rendering "against" is admissible only because the sense of hostility is found in the procedure. The purpose of the children was to cause their parents *to be put to death.* They might have risen up for the protection of their parents, and then *epi* could not have been translated "against." Our translators rendered according to the animus of the actors, and not from the meaning of the word. Mat. 12 : 26—with Mark 3: 25, 26; Luke 11 : 18—"if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against [*epi*] himself." Here the sense of opposition comes from the supposition that Satan is breaking up his own kingdom. The sense is brought to the word. Luke 22 : 52—with Mark 14 : 48, and Acts 4: 27—in another instance, "Be ye come out as against [*epi*] a thief with swords and staves?" Why not "upon" Jesus as well as upon Stephen? Acts 7 : 57.—The rendering "against" has evidently come from the object of the assailants. The "hostile sense" comes not from the word, but from the swords and the staves, from the purpose of the officers, and the place of judgment before the Savior. A multitude might have come upon him for instruction as they often did. Again, there the sense of opposition is not found in the word but is brought to it. Luke 14 : 31—with Mat. 14 : 7; Luke 21 : 36—"One king going to make war against [*epi*] another king, consulteth whether he be able," etc. But one king might have come to another without any hostile feeling. It might have been a friendly visit that was intended. We get the sense, not from the word, but from the wish of the king to *make war.* John 13 : 18.—"He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against [*epi*] me." Here, if the action upon which the figure is based had been simply described, it would have been "lifted up his heel upon me." But the actor is Judas, who was selling his Master into the hands of his enemies, the sense of hostility comes from his purpose and conduct. That sense is not found in the word, but is brought to it from the subject. Acts 13 : 51.—"But they," Paul and Barnabas, "shook off the dust of their feet against [*epi*] them," i. e., the opposers at Antioch in Pisidia. But why against? why not shake off the dust they have gathered upon the place they are leaving? for that is what they did. The reason is found in the direction Christ gave his disciples. Luke 9 : 5.—When the people they visited would not receive them they were to throw the very dust off their feet as a testimony that their peace did not there rest. The sense "against" is found in the meaning of the sign, not in the word. Acts 20 : 30—with ch. 6: 1—Claudius Lysias sends Paul to Felix that he might hear what his accusers had to say against him. And why is the word rendered against? Because the parties hated him and were accusers. The word might have been used of persons who wished to say some-

man of sin" would oppose himself to all that is called god, but that he would withstand God, be an *Antichrist*, and exalt himself above all that is worshipped. The objection which has appeared so formidable to some minds has no force. Peter, and Mary, and Joseph, and all the host of heaven may be adored in the Romish church under the direct sanction of the pontiffs, but that will afford no proof that the Popes are not "the man of sin."

II. A second objection to the application of Paul's prophecy to the Papacy may be thus stated: The Popes do not assert their godhead, they do not claim exclusive deity, which "the man of sin" is to do, they therefore are not the man of sin."

"As Chrysostom has correctly remarked," says Olshausen, "Antichrist will not promote idolatry, but seduce men from the true God, as also from idols, and set himself up as the only object of adoration." He "wants to be the only true God, and suffers none beside him" Com. p. 466. "Exalting himself over and opposing himself to God, and putting down all worship of the deity in whatever form."—Pelt, quoted in Bloomfield's Greek Testament.

"Claiming to himself that adoration which is due to the Deity alone, so as to be the only object of worship."—Bloomfield.

"The awful monster who is to come," says Rev. R. Govett, "not only makes himself equal with God in acts and power, but asserts himself to be superior in nature." "He declares himself to be no creature, but God, eternal, underived, the one true God." "Shows himself as God, owning neither equal nor superior." "He cannot own any law of Jehovah or of his Christ, for he denies their Godhead, and therefore their legislative power." "He alone is the true God." "The Popes say

thing in his favor, and then it would have been differently rendered. The sense of opposition comes, not from the word, but from the hostile feelings of the Jews. Acts 19: 16,—"And the man in whom the evil spirit was, leaped on them, and overcame them, and prevailed against them." The hostile sense is here obtained from the facts of the case. It is suggested by the violent conduct of the possessed one. Rom. 2: 2—with ch. 1: 18—"The judgment of God is against them that commit such things." The sense of opposition comes from the fact that God's righteous law condemns the workers of iniquity. Rom. 4: 18—"Who against hope believed in hope." The reference is to Abraham who hoped to have an heir against all human probability. The sense "against" is given to the word on account of the apparent insuperable difficulties that stood abreast of his hope. 2 Cor. 10: 2—"I think to be bold against some." That is, when he should reach Corinth, Paul thought he should be bold against some who had opposed themselves to him and some of his brethren. He might have been bold in favor of some, then the sense "against" would not have been given to the word. That sense is brought to the word from the nature of the Apostle's purpose. 1 Pet. 3: 12—"The eyes of the Lord are over (*epi* upon) the righteous . . . but the face of the Lord is against (*epi*) them that do evil," margin "upon." And why not in the text as in the margin? The idea seems to be, the eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and his face turned towards the wicked, observing them as evil doers, that he may mark, and record, and punish. But whether so or not, the sense "against" is not found in the word employed. A holy God dislikes sin, and he has set himself against evil doers. The result of this examination is, that in every instance where *epi* is translated "against," it is so rendered because the subject has suggested it; the sense of hostility is, without exception, first found in the passage where the word occurs, and is thence conveyed to the word. By parity of reasoning, if the passage in Paul's prophecy be rendered, "Who opposes and exalteth himself against all that is called God, or is worshipped," the sense of hostility must be brought to the word; it must be shown from Paul's description of the adversary, from the character and purpose of "the man of sin," that he will oppose himself to these objects of worship. And this must be made perfectly clear, for the assumption, a priori, is that he who withstands God and Christ would encourage in some form the idolatries to which nature is prone. The man of sin was to act under the inspiration of Satan who ever has sought to draw away hearts from God. If those who interpret "against"—for with an exception or two they have not so *translated*—have a conviction from independent evidence that the man of sin was to oppose himself to all that is called God, they may feel justified in introducing the sense of opposition into the interpretation. They bring a previous conclusion to the text. But there are those who have no previous belief of the kind. They can find no evidence whatever that the man of sin will oppose all idolatrous worship, and to them there is no proof. In those passages wherein *epi* is translated and rendered against, the sense of hostility is patent, it cannot be controverted; and it must be undeniable in the descriptions given of "the man of sin," before *epi* can be charged with such a sense.

they believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ his only Son, therefore they are not the Antichrist who will deny both."—The Man of Sin, pp. 52, 209, 235, 236.

Olshausen, Pelt, and Bloomfield would not endorse the extreme views of Mr. Govett, but if their views are correct it might be difficult to arrive at the conclusion that the Popes are "the man of sin." Besides Chrysostom and Pelt, Dr. Bloomfield claims Grotius and Koppe as holding like views with himself.

A great number of eminent commentators on the other side see no reason why an antichrist should arise in the future making these extraordinary claims. Nor do the inspired writers endorse these views. *They nowhere teach* that "the man of sin" would assert his *sole* godhead, or claim to be the only object of worship. Neither does Paul teach, as many who are not futurists hold he does teach, that this "man of sin" should exalt himself above the true God, although if he had so taught, *there are senses* in which the Popes would have fulfilled the prediction. Indeed for any being to assert that he is sole god, and yet claim to be above God, is a contradiction. For if he esteem himself the *only* god, to him there is no other, and how can he *assert* that he is superior to a Being whose existence he denies? To assert that he is superior to God, allowed to exist, would seem a moral impossibility except to a madman. For if he assert that he is superior to God (*i. e.*, the God of gods, for such is the assumption) he must affirm, "There is a God, who made heaven, and earth, and the sea, who made the beings from whom I proceed yet I, a man born of a woman, am superior to him." He may assume titles and authority that belong only to God, he may so speak and so act as to exhibit himself that he is God, but to assert that he is superior to God is a sheer absurdity. The testimony of Paul is not that "the man of sin" would assert his superiority to God, nor yet that he would exalt himself above the true God, but above everything called God, or that is worshipped.

He would oppose God, he would usurp his place in the temple, and show himself that he was God; so far he would make himself equal to God, but he does not say that he would exalt himself above him. *The terms "all that is called God" savor of inferiority, and fitly designate false objects of veneration* (comp. 1 Cor. 8: 5.) It is not likely that Paul would class the Divine Being with the herd of gods many and lords many under the common designation "all that is called god." Nor does he. The distinction, as we have before seen, between the true God and these objects of worship is made clear by the apostle. And Daniel, to whose phraseology Paul's seems to be conformed,

UMI

UMI

makes the distinction very prominent. He says, "*above* every god..... *against* the God of gods."

Dr. Pusey (who, of course, with his tendencies, does not believe the Popes to be "the man of sin") quotes Dan. 11 : 36 as applying to an antichrist to come, and gives his comment on the passage. He says "This" (his intense pride and competition with God) "this is the recurring trait; he shall exalt and magnify himself above every god; he shall not regard the god of his fathers..... nor any god shall he regard; for he shall magnify himself above all." "The character is a blank denial of God, not a forgetfulness, nor a practical impiety, nor insolent spoliation; but a self idolatry, a self deifying, which shall compete with the true God, and look down on all besides as being greater than they." "The character," says the Doctor, "is a blank denial of God." Where does Daniel say so? *It is in the commentary, but not in the text.* That this adversary was to compete with God may be true, for he would speak great things against the God of gods; that he would exalt himself above every god Daniel affirms, but that he would make a blank denial of God is not in the record. A blank denial, too, ought to mean a denial of his existence, which certainly the prophet does not teach, and which is not very consistent with competing with him. There is a sense, no doubt, in which this "man of sin" would not regard any god, probably, as standing in the way of his ambitious schemes; he would override all the influence of the gods, even of the god of his fathers; but that he would regard one god at least is evident, for he would honor a god with gold and silver and precious stones. He who makes rich offerings to a god certainly pays a regard to it. Self idolatry, or self deification, there may be in this character, but we look in vain for any assertion of supreme deity, much less of a sole godhead. He assumes the place and authority of God, he exalts himself above every god, he speaks great things against the God of gods, but that he claims to be sole God we do not learn.

Moreover, as the Apostle has carefully selected the terms by which he represents the inferiority of these objects of veneration, so he has carefully chosen the terms by which accurately to depict the assumption of "the man of sin." He does not say that he would claim to be the sole God, or be superior to God, or that he would claim sole worship. His words are, "he [as God] sitteth in the temple of God, *showing* himself that he is God." By what he should do, and by the great swelling words he should utter, he would exhibit himself that he was God. There is an important distinction to be made here. "The man of sin"

would so act and so speak as to show by these deeds and by these utterances that he was God; but that is not *asserting* that he is the true God. The Popes, both by their conduct and their words, have abundantly shown themselves that they are God, but they have never asserted their supreme or sole godhead, nor has Paul ever said that "the man of sin" would assert such a claim.

The meaning of *apodeiknunta* (rendered showing) is of considerable importance in this argument. It exactly points out the manner of claim made by the heads of the Papacy, viz.: by showing that they are God rather than by asserting it. It has been subjected to severe critical tests, but its testimony cannot be shaken. It will give *show, exhibit, display*, or some similar sense, as its primary and general meaning. "*Apodeiknumi*," says Liddell and Scott....."*to point, show forth*, display, make known, whether by word or deed." Dunbar says "*Apodeiknumi*..... to show forth, to hold out to view, to display, to represent, to set forth, to exhibit, to appoint, to prove." Robinson gives "*Apodeiknumi..... to point out, to show.*" He proceeds to state some of the Scriptural uses of the word. He quotes Acts 25 : 7: "The Jews laid many and grievous complaints against Paul which they could not *prove*," that is, could not *show* to be true. Acts 2: 22, "Approved, confirmed of God by miracles."

Dr. Bloomfield (*Lex.*) says: "*Apodeiknumi..... to point out* any person or thing to notice." He refers to 1 Cor. 4 : 9, "I think that God hath *set forth* us the apostles last..... for we are made *a spectacle* unto the world, and to angels, and to men." The word is so rendered by the best translators and commentators early and modern. Wiclif renders, "So that he sitte in the temple of God; and schewe himsilf as if he were God." Tyndale, "And shew him silfe as God." Geneva Vers. "Beare in hand that he is God." Rheims, "Shewing him self as though he were God." Authorized Vers. 1611, "shewing himsilfe that he is God." Bishop's Bible, "showing himself." Jowett, "Showing himself that he is God." Peile, "Exhibiting himself that he is God." Dean Alford, "Showing himself that he is God." Ellicott, "Displaying himself that he is God."

Parkhurst (*Lex*) says, "To show openly or publicly..... to exhibit as on a stage." He adduces two instances, from Strabo and Diodorus Siculus, in which the word is used of a declaration of dignity, as, "He declared him king," "The king showing or declaring himself equal to the twelve gods." In one of these instances the claim of the word to the sense "showing" manifests itself. It is the king showing or declaring himself

According to the editor of *The Critical English Testament*, "Herodotus says more than once, 'declare the Cæsar.'" Even this use of the word would not unfitly represent the assumption of the heads of the Romish Church. Sitting in the temple of God, declaring himself that he is God, would find a good sense in the doings and sayings of the Popes. But in fact this is a very unusual sense of the word, and two or three instances in which writers have used the word in an unusual sense must not displace the primary and almost universally accepted meaning of it. The argument from these sentences would be, *apodeiknumi* is used several times in the rare sense "declare;" therefore when writing of "the man of sin" Paul uses it, not in the almost universally admitted sense of "show," but in the unusual sense "declare," and he must be understood as affirming that "the man of sin" would declare himself God! And this declaration must be understood to be made, not by certain blasphemous words and deeds which should claim an equality with God, but as an actual assertion that he was God!

The examination of this prominent word shows that Paul does not say "the man of sin" would assert his godhead, but that he would show or display himself that he is God, using the same word that he employs when he says that himself and his fellow apostles were exhibited a spectacle to the world.

It is evident, too, that "the man of sin" was to reach the highest pitch of arrogance and self-exaltation when he should take God's seat in the temple, and exhibit himself as God. Not by exalting himself above the true God was he to reach the hight of his daring impiety, but when he should make himself like God by taking his place, and assuming his authority. It is by that act of arrogant assumption that "the man of sin" exalts himself above all that is called God. The Apostle does not describe two distinct acts, one of exaltation above the God of gods, and the lords many, and another by which he should assume equality with God; but one daring act of lifting himself into God's seat, and thereby exalting himself above all inferior objects. For he who sits on the throne of the most High, has all the other objects of worship at his footstool.

We have a like picture in Isaiah's prophecy. God's oppressed people sing over the downfall of the arrogant king of Babylon, "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer [day star, margin], son of the morning. For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will sit upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north [common meeting-place of the gods]: I will ascend above the hights of the clouds; I will be

like the most High." (ch. 14 : 12–14.) Here the inflated master of kingdoms, proposes in his heart to ascend *above* the clouds, and exalt his throne *above* the stars, but not *above* the true God. The summit of his desired exaltation was reached, when he says, in his heart, "I will *be like* the most High." When he should be lifted to the throne of the *most High*, he would be above the clouds and the stars.

That Paul's "man of sin" would assume no greater exaltation than the seat of God is evident from the manner in which the apostle has described his advance to this assumption. "Exalteth himself," he says, "above all that is called God," *so that*, "insomuch that [*oste*] he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Here is a progression. "Insomuch that," not in so little that. He reaches the culminating point of his assumption when he has taken the seat of God in the temple. Luke says, "That Simon and his helpers filled both the ships [with fishes], so that [*oste buth*] they were sinking." (Luke 5 : 7.) The boats were so laden that they had reached the utmost limit of sustaining their burdens, and were at the point of sinking. "God so loved the world," says Christ to Nicodemus, "that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth should not perish," etc., literally, *so that* [*oste*] he gave his Son. He reached the highest measure of his love when he gave his Son to save man. Of the assumption of Paul's "man of sin," Ellicott says, "*oste auton...kath*—'*so that he sitteth down*:' his arrogance rises to such an impious hight as to lead to this uttermost act of unholy daring." He does not exalt himself above the true God, but reaches the *uttermost* act of unholy daring when he takes the Divine seat, and shows himself that he is God. Olshausen puts a different construction on what Paul says: "These words, are substantially a result which is understood of itself of what precedes. Whoever exalts himself above all that is called God, must necessarily consider and call himself God." But if the true God be not included in the list of divinities over whom he exalteth himself, that does not at all follow; for a man might exalt himself above all the host of gods, and not thereby make himself equal to the true God, or be warranted to consider and call himself God. He might consider himself far above these vain things without considering himself God.

The apostle's teaching then is, that "the man of sin" would exalt himself above every inferior object of worship, whether god or man—that he would usurp the seat of God in his temple, and so display himself as to show that he was God—and that by that daring act of presumption he would uplift himself above all that is called god. He would exalt himself above these, he says,

"*insomuch that* he sitteth in the temple, showing himself that he is God."

Now, if "the man of sin" was to exalt himself above inferior gods only, if by his deeds and his words he was to *show* that he was God, and if the uttermost act of unholy daring was to be reached when he should exhibit himself in the temple in God's seat, *then* is there no proof that he would declare his sole or supreme godhead; and then the description given by the prophecy of the assumption of "the man of sin" has been so far fulfilled in the popes.

III. We now come to the third principal objection, which some writers have thought of considerable force in the argument. The popes, it is urged, have not exalted themselves above all that is called god or that is worshipped; they worship the virgin Mary and angels, they venerate the saints, therefore they are not "the man of sin." Dean Alford places this objection in as strong a light as it will bear. Most later writers, too, who use it quote from him, and appear to be considerably influenced by his opinion; he may therefore be considered as representing the views of other objectors. He says: "In the characteristic of v. 4 (2 Thes. 2), the Pope does not, and never did, fulfill the prophecy. Allowing all the striking coincidences with the latter part of the verse which have been so abundantly adduced, it never can be shown that he fulfills the former part, nay, so far is he from it that the abject adoration of, and submission to *legomenoi theoi* [those called gods], and *Sebasmata* [things worshipped] has ever been one of his notable characteristics."

There was evidently in the mind of this writer, as there has been in the minds of some others, an overwhelming difficulty in the way of applying this characteristic to the popes. "The man of sin" was to exalt himself above all that is worshipped, but the popes adore saints and angels; it could not therefore be predicted of them that they would exalt themselves above all that is worshipped. No man or series of men can do these two things, it is said, for if they exalt themselves above these, how can they give them their submission; and if they adore them, how can they exalt themselves above them? We are asked which of these two sides of the question we will take, and we unhesitatingly reply, *both;* the exaltation *and* the submission. For, first, the exaltation is one of position simply, and not of purposed dominancy over all that is worshipped. The usurper vaults into the seat of God, and *thereby* lifts himself above these things. And, secondly, with our poor fallen perverted nature, it is no strange thing to find lofty pretension and abject servility

meeting in the same persons. History will furnish us with instances of men who have even assumed Divine authority and honor while they have worshipped foolish gods. Caligula, Caius Cæsar, both worshipped the gods and exalted himself above them. He claimed divine honors, and erected a temple which he dedicated to his own divinity.

"He built one part of his palace as far as the Forum, and so continued it that the Temple of Castor and Pollux seemed to be no more than the portico of his imperial mansion. He would frequently show himself in the midst between his brother deities, to be adored by them who came to him about business, and some there were who out of flattery saluted him by the name of Jupiter Latiaris." "He also frequented that temple of Jupiter, which they style the capitol, which is with them the most holy of temples, and had boldness enough to call himself the brother of Jupiter. Yet while he exhibited himself that he was divine, he offered at the shrine of the gods."—Suetonius' Caligula, p. 245; Josephus, Antiq. 19: 1.

Domitian claimed to be divine. He declared himself to be a god, and caused temples to be erected to his honor, and divine worship to be paid to him. Not satisfied with the title of lord and master, he added to it that of god. Yet he built a chapel in honor of Jupiter in the lifetime of his father, and a magnificent temple after his accession to the empire, in which he placed a statue to that god holding him in his arms. And though he passed an edict by which he banished astrologers from Rome, he firmly believed in their delusive arts. (Rees's *Cyclopedia.*)

Antiochus Epiphanes will afford another illustration. He well sustained this double character. He made himself a god, and yet paid his devotions to a god or gods whom he delighted to honor. He took the name Epiphanes—illustrious. He also bore the name *theos* (god), which is still seen on his coins. He spake marvellous things against the God of gods; and assumed to determine what god should be worshipped. (See 1 Mac. 1: 41–51.) He thus exalted himself above those called gods. But while thus exalting himself, he was a worshipper of the gods.

Livy says, "In two respects he was distinguished for a noble mind; for his worship of the gods, and for his favor towards cities in adorning them."—Livy, 12: 20. "In the sacrifices (sent) to the cities," says Polybius, "and in the honor to the gods, he surpassed all who had reigned before him. This one may judge from the temple of Jupiter Olympius at Athens, and the statues around the altar at Delos."—Polyb. in Ath., v. 21, p. 94, etc.

We have here three prominent characters of history bearing the double characteristics of exalting themselves above the things that are worshipped, and yet paying to some of them their adorations; and if Caligula, and Domitian, and Antiochus have exalted themselves above the gods, and yet worshipped them, why is it impossible for the popes to do the same?

It may be objected that these are selected and remarkable cases, that the popes are a *series* of men, and it is unlikely that all of them should exalt themselves above all that is worshipped, and worship some of the things above which they have exalted themselves. The reply to this objection is at hand. For,

first, all the popes have not offered abject submission to saints and angels. It is affirmed that one of them said "he believed no more in the virgin Mary than in an ass," and the charge of Atheism was frequently made against the popes in the councils of the middle ages. Such popes would be very much wanting in veneration for these secondary objects of worship; and some no doubt were too wise and too good to adore them.

But the principal reply is, that the popes were subjected to influences such as no other class of men on earth have been brought under. There are two forces of human nature which, strongly acted upon by peculiar and exciting circumstances, have moved them on the one hand to exalt themselves above these objects of worship, and on the other hand to place them on their knees before some of them. One force is the love of power and authority which led to their taking the seat of God in the temple, and, Herod-like, accepting the flatteries of the people who, as they issued their mandates, said, "It is the voice of a god." The ignorance of the people and the decline of the Roman Empire were the means of placing great power in their hands, until impiously they allowed the title "Lord God the Pope." The other force which moved them in another direction is the tendency of human nature to cherish a superstitious regard for inferior objects of worship. This tendency early manifested itself amongst the adherents of the Romish Church, and was found in full force amongst the pagan nations. And that the church might attract these people to her fold, she accepted some of their divinities with a change of name and ritual. Jupiter, for instance, became Peter, and Venus the virgin Mary. The popes of course had to venerate these objects. Most of the men too who have sat in Peter's chair have been educated in the system that invested them with divine authority, and required their homage to these objects of worship. They had to believe, or profess to believe if they did not, that they sat in the seat of God, while they had to be patterns of humility in their veneration for saints and angels.

Moreover Daniel's "man of sin" (ch. 11), which futurists say is the identical antichrist whose revelation Paul predicts, was, according to the prophet's own showing, to assume these diverse characteristics which it is said the pope cannot fulfill. "And the king (says Daniel) shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods..... Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any god: for he shall magnify himself above all. But in his estate shall he honor the God of forces: and a god

whom his fathers knew not shall he honor with gold and silver," etc. "Thus shall he do in the most strongholds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory: and he shall cause them to rule over many," etc. (Dan. 11: 36–39). Newton translates the last portion of this passage: "To the defenders of Mahuzzim together with the strange god whom he shall acknowledge, he shall multiply honor."

Dr. Pusey's translation does not vary much from that of our English version. He renders, "He shall exalt himself above every god; and he shall not regard the God of his fathers; nor regard the desire of women, nor any god; for he shall magnify himself above all. But in his estate he shall honor the god of forces, and agod whom his fathers knew not shall he honor with gold and silver and with precious stones, and pleasant things. Thus shall he do in the most strongholds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory." (*Lectures on Daniel*, pp. 93, 94.) This "man of sin," whoever he may be, was in some way to exalt himself above every god, yet there was one god at least (the text seems to intimate that there were more) whom he should acknowledge and honor, and at whose shrine he should make costly offerings.

The Doctor's comments on this passage do not affect these conclusions. He denies that the prophecy depicts the character and doings of Antiochus. "The whole of the character," he says, "centers in one point, that intensity of pride and competition with God, which are known of only in Satan and the Antichrist." He assigns to this Antichrist six characteristics, three of which are, (1) Self-exaltation above every god; (2) contempt of all religion. (6) The honoring of a god whom his fathers knew not. "Even his god," he says, "is of his own creation, a strange god whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory," and "it is not *strange gods*, but one strange unknown of god, whom he shall recognise." (p. 96). Still this "man of sin" exalts himself above all the gods, while he acknowledges and honors and increases with glory, at least, one of them. We reach the same conclusion again. This supposed future Antichrist will do the things thought to be contradictory in the popes. But this honored god "is of his own creation." Where in the record we are told this, is not easily discoverable; but allowing that it is so, how does that show that he is not an idolater? For men first to make their god and then worship it is no new thing, and the folly and degradation are certainly none the less. And it is "not *strange gods*, but one strange unknown god," that this adversary is to honor. It does not follow that because he should take a strange god into his favor,

that he would reject all others; putting a new god on the list of objects venerated would not be without precedent. But suppose it to be so, he still pays honor to one of the gods many. And if a false god, or false gods be honored and enriched, how is there contempt of all religions true or false? *If then Daniel describes a future Antichrist, he will do the two things which it is said the popes cannot do.* He will magnify himself above all that is called God, and render homage at the shrine of an idol.

Moreover, not only have these double characteristics been exemplified in historic personages, not only were they to mark Daniel's "man of sin," they have been fulfilled in the popes themselves. The popes cannot be "the man of sin," we are told, because they have paid submission to some of the things worshipped, and it therefore could not be predicted of them that they would exalt themselves above the things worshipped. But, as a matter of fact they have done the two things. It is useless to say that they cannot do two things deemed to be contradictory, when they have done both.

Clement VI., as we have seen, in his Bull concerning the Jubilee, ordered the angels of Paradise to admit into its glories the souls of those who died on their journey, as being certainly freed from Purgatory. A larger power than this has been claimed for the Pope; he is not only "god on earth" but "lord of all things celestial, terrestrial, and infernal." (*Anthoninus*, Part 3. tit 22.) Here, certainly, the Pope is exalted above the things that are worshipped. By commanding the ministers of his throne he assumes over them the authority of God; and if he is lord over all things celestial, terrestrial, and infernal, he must be lord of the things worshipped, whether they be in heaven or on earth,—yet as the head of the Church he would have to adore, or profess to adore, some of the things of which he is called lord.

Pope Innocent III. said, "The Pope even changes the nature of things, and may make something out of nothing; he can do these things because his will stands for reason, for *he can dispense with holy laws . . . . . by converting and changing ordinances.*"

Bernard affirms that "none except God is like the Pope, either *in heaven* or on earth." (*Bernard*, 1725.) Stephen, Archbishop of Petraca, declared in the council of the Lateran that Leo possessed "power above all persons *in heaven* and on earth." (*Labbeus*, 19, 924.) This blasphemy passed in an œcumenical council. It is unnecessary to multiply evidence, these extracts will be sufficient to show that it has been claimed by

and for the popes that they control heaven and earth, especially in the spiritual realm; they certainly therefore exalt themselves over all that is worshipped, while they venerate saint and angels. Indeed, these extremes have been notable features in the characters of the popes, which have often excited the attention of observers. Their title has been on the one hand "a god upon earth," and on the other "a servant of the servants of God." (See *Giesler*, 2, p. 132, *note.*) Everard, Bishop of Salzburg, exclaimed in the Council of Ratisbon, "He who is the servant of servants desires to be lord of lords." "What a mystery" says a modern writer, "is Rome! What contradictions it harmonizes! What extremes center in this mystic Babylon! The pride of its supreme head reaches to the very heavens—his humility prostrates him to the very earth. He can trample upon kings, bestow continents upon his vassals, yet gird himself with sackcloth and wash the beggars' feet. Monuments are raised to his honor with the inscription, '*Deservedly thou art believed to be a god upon earth,*' yet he is the servant of the servants of Christ!" (Dr. B. Evans, *Modern Popery*, p. 34.)

IV. There are some minor objections, most of which it will not be needful to notice; there are two, however, which from the frequency with which they are adduced seem to demand some attention.

First, it is said the terms employed cannot be well used of a series of persons such as the popes; that the terms, "the man of sin, the son of perdition," will only describe some one person. Olshausen says, "son of perdition might be given to any bad man, but the article (*the* son, etc.,) only admits of the reference to a definite known individual. The name *anthropos* (man) characterizes him at the same time as a real man." Alford says, "To the proof of his individuality, his second title lends great weight. The man of sin is also the son of perdition."

Olshausen's argument from the use of the article is soon disposed of. Paul had been with the Thessalonians, and had spoken to them of the revelation of evil that was to be made in the future. He now writes to them about the subject of their conversation, and would very naturally write of "that man of sin, the son of perdition" of whom he had before informed them. "Remember ye not," he says, "that when I was with you I told you these things." (v. 5) Or Paul might be referring back to Daniel's vision in his seventh chapter, where the same enemy appears.

But neither the use of the article, nor of the word "man" requires that the Apostle's words should be understood of an individual. Whether of a series of persons, or a class of per-

sons, or persons of a certain moral character, both the article and the singular number are frequently used in the Scriptures. The same pen that wrote, "the man of sin, the son of perdition," wrote also, "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that '*the* man of God' may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. 3 : 16) The inspired instruction was not given to perfect some "definite known individual," but for a large class of men, many of whom are yet unborn, and certainly not "known" of those persons to whom Paul wrote. The same Apostle writes, "*The* bishop (*ton episkopon*) must be blameless." (Tit. 1 : 7) *The* bishop of certain required character, was not some known definite individual. "*The* new man" (Eph. 4 : 24) describes the character of a number of men of every age. It is said the popes were a series of officials occupying some ages of time? so were the high priests amongst the Jews, yet Paul uses the article and the singular number of them, just as he does "the man of sin." "But into the second (tabernacle,) went the high priest, alone once every year." (Heb. 9 : 7) The terms, *the* high priest, might be used of any one of them for the time being, but they comprehended all of them in the succession, from Aaron to the last high priest who officiated in the temple. See also Lev. 21 : 10–15. In his general epistle Peter exhorts, "Honor *the king*" (1 Peter 2 : 17), a standing exhortation that includes every sovereign of a succession.

"*The woman*" who was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls, was "*the* woman" of sin. In her hand was a cup full of abominations. "And I saw," says John, "*the* woman drunken with the blood of..... the martyrs of Jesus." (Rev. 17 : 4–6) Her destiny too, even as that of "the man of sin," is destruction. (v. 16) But this surely is the character and destiny of no individual woman.

We have met the argument in the shape in which it is put, but in fact the true answer is of another kind. Paul's words are a prophecy; "man of sin" is a sign, or symbol of something else that was to come; not some man that should be, but representative of a number of persons who were to appear to work sin, just as the woman of sin is put for a number of agencies that should debauch the minds of the kings of the earth, and shed the blood of the saints.

To the futurists who believe that the beast who rose out of the sea is identical with "the man of sin," the proof of this ought to be very clear. For this hostile power has seven heads and ten horns. It surely could not be meant that in the future

time a beast like this would arise, but some great power was symbolized by it. And with seven heads and ten horns it surely could not be the sign of some "definite individual." Olshausen evidently had not thought of the bearing of this vision on the subject, when he wrote on the prophecy in the Thessalonians that the use of the article and the word "man" admitted only of the reference to a "definite known individual." He falters greatly when he treats of this vision in the Revelation. Looking back to his interpretation of the prophecy in Thessalonians, he says, "But the description of the Apocalypse seems less favorable to that assumption. The representative of Antichrist as a beast with seven heads (Rev. 13 : 1) rather seems to lead to a multiplicity of antichrists." He lets down the former interpretation very softly, but if it be many antichrists rather than one, it cannot be an individual. This adversary is seen as a beast too, when it is slain (Rev. 19 : 20), and is therefore a symbol. Daniel's four beasts were symbols, not of individual kings, but of kingdoms with many heads. The difference is, that a beast is, in form, more unlike what is symbolized; but it is quite lawful for signs to bear a close or distant resemblance to the things signified, or no resemblance at all. Some of the beasts of Daniel's and John's visions have no likeness in their forms to the things represented. Daniel's little horn had eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things. Some parts of the form in the vision were like to a man, but substantially the appearance was that of a horn; it was a mixed symbol. In Rev. 1 : 13, John saw one *like unto* the Son of man. It was not the Son of man (see vv. 15, 16), but a symbolic form representing him; here was symbolism with a resemblance. Daniel, too, saw one like unto the Son of man, and they brought him to the Ancient of days. (Dan. 7 : 9–13)

In Rev. 5 : 6 one appears taking the book out of the hand of him that sat upon the throne. No one can doubt who was meant, yet it was not the real personage John saw (for the vision was that of a lamb, having seven horns and seven eyes), but the Son of man symbolically represented. So when Paul predicts some evil power that was to arise, he does not use the terms "man of sin" and "son of perdition," as a literal description of what was to be revealed in the distance—not of the identical something that should appear—but as an expressive sign of some development of evil to be made in the future. It might be a sign homogeneous, and represent some individual, but need not. Nebuchadnezzar saw a "man of sin" in the shape of a huge image, complicate in its make, because it was to represent a fourfold power; a "man of sin" representing the

UMI

tyranical world-power that was to rule the nations by brute force, and suppress the rule of righteousness. That "man of sin" swayed the destinies of the world till, growing feeble, his empire declined, and the second "man of sin" gathered up the power, and associated with it all the deceit of unrighteousness that marked his rule. This is Paul's "man of sin," who is not complicate in his make, because he represents one consolidated power. But as the man seen by Nebuchadnezzar was not identical with a man to appear, but the symbol of certain powers to arise with their many kings; so Paul's "man of sin" symbolized a huge power that was to arise with its many heads, but of a different type, and therefore distinguished from the earlier world powers.

V. Another objection, upon which some stress has been laid, is that the popes do not sit in the temple of God, which Paul says "the man of sin" would do; the popes, therefore, it is argued, cannot be "the man of sin."

Futurists, who adduce this objection, think the temple of which God must be understood of a literal temple in Jerusalem, and look for the fulfillment of this sitting in some temple to be found there when "the man of sin" shall be revealed. "An objection fatal to interpreting the temple of God here of the church," says the editor of the *Critical and Explanatory Bible,* "is that the Apostle would never designate the apostate anti-christian church as the temple of God." The same body, it is said, cannot be both the temple of God and the apostasy; and if the Romish church is the apostasy, it cannot be the temple of God.

But the Apostle does not say that the degenerate body, of he was treating, would be, at the same time the apostasy and the temple of God. When he wrote, the Christian body—that afterwards degenerated and became the apostasy—was the temple of God, and the name was carried down to the time when the "man of sin" took the seat of God, that the usurper and his place might be identified. "Temple of God" was familiar phraseology with the Apostle for the body of professed believers. He uses the phrase in writing to the Corinthians, the Ephesians, and the Thessalonians. He tells the Ephesians that they were fellow-citizens with the saints; men built upon the foundation common to those who were far off, and those that were nigh; that the building fitly-framed grew into a *holy temple,* a habitation for God through the Spirit. (Eph. 2 : 17–22) When he wrote to the Thessalonians, some evil leaven had already begun to work, which, in the future, would grow into an apostasy and develop "the man of sin." Still the body retained its corporate character and its name, and assumed *par excellence* to be the Church of God.

Now Paul, writing to Christians of his time whom he recognizes as being of the temple of God, says, "This 'man of sin' will sit in the temple of God; and at the same time warns them that a degeneracy had begun which would wax into an apostasy. God's habitation was the Church: there he dwelt, and there he ruled, but the time came when he left it as the place where he loved to dwell; he best knows when. It had become defiled and he departed, and Antichrist assumed his place in what was the temple of God." "It appears necessary," says Olshausen, "to understand the temple of God here in a symbolical sense of the Christian Church, which is elsewhere too called (2 Cor. 6 : 16; Eph. 2 : 21) *naos* in the New Testament, as Christ's abode through the Spirit. The sense of the words would then be this—Antichrist will think to thrust Christ, the real object of adorvtion, out of the church, and put himself in his place." The retention of the old name when the place has become defiled is not confined to the degenerate church. This same writer, Paul, after he has designated the saint's temples of God, says, "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy, for the temple of God is holy." In his supposition the man has become so defiled that God will destroy him, and he gives as a reason that the temple of God must be holy; yet, polluted as he is, he still bears the name—temple of God.

We have, too, more than one instance in relation to the temple of Jerusalem, where the name has been retained after the sanctity had been lost. In the days of Ezekiel the prophet, the people and the princes of the people had made themselves vile, and the priests had become corrupt. God was displeased and refused to dwell amongst them. And in a vision the prophet saw the glory of God, the sign of his presence, remove from its place in the sanctuary. It moved from the interior of the holy place to the threshold and from the threshold to the door of the east gate. It then left the city altogether, and stood on the mountain on the east side of the city. You may write Ichabod on the temple, God has deserted it, the glory has departed; yet while it is being deserted, while God refuses to occupy it, it carries its old name. It is still the Lord's house (Ezk. 10 : 4, 14, 18, 19; 11 : 23; 12 : 19; 20 : 40; 21 : 2). So when the Lord Jesus was upon earth, in his visits to the temple, he found a number of covetous dishonest traders, buyers and sellers who had polluted the sanctuary by their corrupt traffic, and turned it into a den of thieves; yet it retains its name; it is still "the temple of God." (Matt. 21 : 12, 13) It is evident too that the Romish church, after it had become an apostasy, still bore the name temple of

God. At the council of Rheims, Arnulph, Bishop of Orleans, pointing to the Pontiff, said:—

"Who is that seated upon a high throne, radiant with purple and gold? Verily, if he thus follows uncharitableness and is puffed up, it must be Antichrist sitting in the temple of God."—Rosetti on The Anti-Papal Spirit, &c., vol. 1, p. 6.

Bloomfield says, "Considering the highly allegorical and symbolical nature of the whole of this passage, there can be little difficulty in supposing that by 'the temple of God' is meant (as almost all ancient, and many eminent modern, expositors understand) the Christian church."—In loc.

Olshausen says, "Now if any one reflects that in the temple at Jerusalem there was no image or throne of Jehovah at all beyond the ark of the covenant—that besides, according to Mat. 24:2, and John 4:21, the demolished temple is not to be built up again; it appears, as too the later interpreters assume, necessary to understand the temple of God here in the symbolical sense of the Christian church (2 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 2:21), *naos* in the New Testament as Christ's abode through the spirit."

Referring to De Wette's and Luneman's objections, Alford says, "But there is no force in this, *o naos ton Theou* is used metaphorically by St. Paul in 1 Cor. 3:17, *bis*, and why not here? See also 1 Cor. 6:16; Ephes. 2:21. From these passages it is plain that such figurative sense was familiar with the Apostle, and if so *kathizei* ('sitteth') makes no difficulty."—Alford in loc.

And have these futurists, who will have "the man of sin" to sit in a material temple at Jerusalem, overlooked the requirements of their own scheme? Paul must not call the degenerate church by its old name, temple of God, if it has since become the apostasy; but how then will they find a temple against which the same objection may not be levelled? Suppose they have evaded Olshausen's hindrance to their project, that the temple is never to be rebuilt, and that in the time to come, some imagined temple is erected, and occupied by a future "man of sin;" then how will such erection become the temple of God? It is not to be rebuilt by the Church of God, its rites and ceremonies are not to be Christian. But assuming that he will accept it as his abode, and desire it as his rest, how then does it pass into the occupancy of "the man of sin?" This monster of iniquity, who it is affirmed will exceed all the sinners of the past in the depth of his wickedness, and will assert that he only is God, will come and take the Divine seat in the temple, and rule there instead of God! But assuming, again, that this transfer of the temple from God to this wicked (one) has been made, how then can this seat and shrine of the usurper be called the temple of God? Can it be the temple of God, and the temple of that monster of sin at the same time? and if not, it can be called the temple of God in no other sense than that it has been his temple, and that the name has been carried down to the time of occupancy by "the man of sin."

* * * * * *

The end has not come, the final destruction has not yet fallen upon the anti-christian system. We may not say when it will,

but we may observe the signs of the paesent, and mark the progress of events. And it may not be deemed presumptuous to conclude that we have seen the beginning of the end. The testimony of both Paul and Daniel is that the final destruction of the adverse system is to be preceded by a preliminary wasting. "Whom," says Paul, "the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." Daniel speaks even more strongly. He not only indicates a wasting process, but seems to give an idea of repeated destructive strokes by which the antagonistic power should be brought low. "The judgment shall sit," he says, "and they shall take away his dominion to consume, and to destroy it unto the end." The word *analosei* is evidently used by Paul in the sense consume, or waste, or destroy in other than the absolute sense, for *katargesei* (destroy) is used in connection with it, and the two words cannot be thus used of a final destruction. Alford renders "Whom he will *destroy* by the breath of his mouth, and annihilate by the appearance of his coming." But he cannot mean, by the first word, literal destruction, for "the man of sin" could not be annihilated after he had been destroyed. The sense consumed, is given by both ancient and modern translators. Tyndale translates, "Shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the appearance of his coming." Cranmer, "Shall consume," &c. Geneva version, "Consume with the Spirit of his mouth." Ellicott, "Whom the Lord shall consume with the breath of his mouth, and shall destroy with the appearance of his coming." Peile renders, "Whom the Lord shall consume with the breath of his mouth, and bring to nought by the manifestation of his presence."

This anti-Christian power has not been finally destroyed, but a process of wasting has been weakening it, and some heavy strokes have fallen upon it. Nothing can be more evident than that the dominion of this "man of sin," so powerful in the past, who has spoken great words against the most High, and has worn out his saints, is being consumed and destroyed unto the end. Earlier generations have witnessed it, and the consumption of the present time is making haste. A public writer has thus summed up the losses which the Papacy has suffered during the last few years:—

"The real material props of Popery, on which it has rested for ages, are being knocked away with astonishing rapidity. Irreverent hands are undermining the citadel of 'the faith,' and the whole thing is likely to come to the ground one of these days with an awful crash. The liberation of Venetia swept away the last hope of the reconquest of Italy to Papal authority. The Polish church has been virtually set free, clerical power in Mexico overthrown, church property has been sequestrated throughout Italy, and Ultramontanism has been expelled from Hungary. With the revival of constitutional life, the Hapsburg concordat perished; but not in the kingdom of Hungary only was this old covenant with Rome broken, for,

UMI

to the dismay of the Pope, the Austrian Reichstradt has followed the example, and by a vote of 130 to 25, solemnly decreed that the concordat should cease to exist. In less than twelve months the Papacy has lost the control of three great kingdoms, a province nearly as large as a kingdom, and property which in Italy, Mexico, and Poland, must be worth, at the very least, $500,000,000 and might twenty years hence have been valued at thrice that sum. And now, as if the humiliation of the sovereign Pontiff were not deep enough already, Russia has added her powerful voice to the rough chorus that shouts the downfall of priestly domination. And let no one ask, what has the Emperor of Russia, as the head of the Greek church, to do with the Latin church and its Pope? for there is a Roman Catholic church in Russia, and there, as everywhere, it seeks supremacy; that is to say, it acknowledges only the Pope. But an imperial ukase regulating the relations between the Roman Catholic church of Russia and the Papal See has just been published,...and the Sixth Article forbids any person whatever receiving Papal documents without submitting them to the Minister of the Interior, under pain of punishment, and rules that 'all decisions received from Rome in an illegal manner shall be void.'"

Since this was written, Spain, with its intensely Roman Catholic Government, the home of Inquisitions, and bitter intolerance; Spain, the second hope of the Papacy in its troubles, has broken from her allegiance, and abjured the rule of the Pope. What form of government she may assume is not yet decided, but she has declared for civil and religious liberty, and already Protestant worship is celebrated in her capital, and the Bible freely distributed amongst her people. It may be confidently affirmed, that she will never go back to her servile submission to Papal rule.

In *the past* we have seen striking resemblances between the predictions of Paul, and the history of the Papacy; it is evident that *the present* as remarkably fulfills the prophetic programme. *The end* is not yet; the hand that is to give the final stroke has not yet fallen; but as a persecuting power, as a pawer that has fascinated and awed the potentates of earth, that has oppressed truth and truth's witnesses, and has been hostile to social freedom and progress; it is patent to the civilized world, that the dominion of the Papacy is being "consumed and destroyed unto the end."[1]—*Sel.*

[1] This was written in 1869. The events of 1870, in relation to the Papacy, are even more striking than any that have preceded. The temporal power is quite extinguished, and the church itself is threatened with serious schisms.—ED.

SHEOL.

I have simply followed, as my custom is, the Concordance, and endeavored in each case to determine the meaning of the word from the connection in which it stands.—M. Stuart.

So strong an association is apt to be established in the mind between certain expressions and the *technical* sense to which they have been confined in theological system, that when the student meets them in Scripture, he at once understands them in that sense, in passages where perhaps an unbiased examination of the context would plainly show that such was not the author's meaning.—Abp. Whately.

Whenever a writer has used any given word a considerable number of times, if we find authorities differing as to its import, we may safely appeal to the author's usage for the sense he intended. And if in a collation of the passages where it occurs we find that the analogy and context in each case justifies, and in many instances demand that we attach a particular signification, we may be sure that that was the sense the author intended to convey; that it is his definition of the term.

The word *sheol* occurs in the Old Testament Scriptures *sixty-four* times. *What import does inspired usage attach to it?* is the question to which we shall attempt an answer in the present article. The inquiry is of considerable importance, for it involves another question of no small interest, viz.: Are the dead conscious?

A late, and to our mind in many respects the best English version of the Scriptures, obscures the Bible doctrine of the state of the dead by translating the Hebrew word under consideration by the English compound word, *Under-world*. We have been at a loss for a reason why a body of scholars whose announced intention is to give us a translation in which every Hebrew or Greek word shall, so far as possible, be rendered by an expressive equivalent in English, should have chosen such an indefinite phrase to express a term of vital importance in the discussion of some points in theology. For they have given us a word whose purport every man must judge for himself; for the lexicographers give us no definition of it that can be accepted as at all related to the sense of the Hebrew word for which it stands: for, certainly, we may not suppose that it relates to the earth, as beneath or under the heavens; nor to "that part of the world beyond the horizon."

UMI

to the dismay of the Pope, the Austrian Reichstradt has followed the example, and by a vote of 130 to 25, solemnly decreed that the concordat should cease to exist. In less than twelve months the Papacy has lost the control of three great kingdoms, a province nearly as large as a kingdom, and property which in Italy, Mexico, and Poland, must be worth, at the very least, $500,000,000 and might twenty years hence have been valued at thrice that sum. And now, as if the humiliation of the sovereign Pontiff were not deep enough already, Russia has added her powerful voice to the rough chorus that shouts the downfall of priestly domination. And let no one ask, what has the Emperor of Russia, as the head of the Greek church, to do with the Latin church and its Pope? for there is a Roman Catholic church in Russia, and there, as everywhere, it seeks supremacy; that is to say, it acknowledges only the Pope. But an imperial ukase regulating the relations between the Roman Catholic church of Russia and the Papal See has just been published,...and the Sixth Article forbids any person whatever receiving Papal documents without submitting them to the Minister of the Interior, under pain of punishment, and rules that 'all decisions received from Rome in an illegal manner shall be void.'"

Since this was written, Spain, with its intensely Roman Catholic Government, the home of Inquisitions, and bitter intolerance; Spain, the second hope of the Papacy in its troubles, has broken from her allegiance, and abjured the rule of the Pope. What form of government she may assume is not yet decided, but she has declared for civil and religious liberty, and already Protestant worship is celebrated in her capital, and the Bible freely distributed amongst her people. It may be confidently affirmed, that she will never go back to her servile submission to Papal rule.

In *the past* we have seen striking resemblances between the predictions of Paul, and the history of the Papacy; it is evident that *the present* as remarkably fulfills the prophetic programme. *The end* is not yet; the hand that is to give the final stroke has not yet fallen; but as a persecuting power, as a pawer that has fascinated and awed the potentates of earth, that has oppressed truth and truth's witnesses, and has been hostile to social freedom and progress; it is patent to the civilized world, that the dominion of the Papacy is being "consumed and destroyed unto the end."[1]—*Sel.*

[1] This was written in 1869. The events of 1870, in relation to the Papacy, are even more striking than any that have preceded. The temporal power is quite extinguished, and the church itself is threatened with serious schisms.—Ed.

SHEOL.

I have simply followed, as my custom is, the Concordance, and endeavored in each case to determine the meaning of the word from the connection in which it stands.—M. Stuart.

So strong an association is apt to be established in the mind between certain expressions and the *technical* sense to which they have been confined in theological system, that when the student meets them in Scripture, he at once understands them in that sense, in passages where perhaps an unbiased examination of the context would plainly show that such was not the author's meaning.—Abp. Whately.

Whenever a writer has used any given word a considerable number of times, if we find authorities differing as to its import, we may safely appeal to the author's usage for the sense he intended. And if in a collation of the passages where it occurs we find that the analogy and context in each case justifies, and in many instances demand that we attach a particular signification, we may be sure that that was the sense the author intended to convey; that it is his definition of the term.

The word *sheol* occurs in the Old Testament Scriptures *sixty-four* times. *What import does inspired usage attach to it?* is the question to which we shall attempt an answer in the present article. The inquiry is of considerable importance, for it involves another question of no small interest, viz.: Are the dead conscious?

A late, and to our mind in many respects the best English version of the Scriptures, obscures the Bible doctrine of the state of the dead by translating the Hebrew word under consideration by the English compound word, *Under-world.* We have been at a loss for a reason why a body of scholars whose announced intention is to give us a translation in which every Hebrew or Greek word shall, so far as possible, be rendered by an expressive equivalent in English, should have chosen such an indefinite phrase to express a term of vital importance in the discussion of some points in theology. For they have given us a word whose purport every man must judge for himself; for the lexicographers give us no definition of it that can be accepted as at all related to the sense of the Hebrew word for which it stands: for, certainly, we may not suppose that it relates to the earth, as beneath or under the heavens; nor to "that part of the world beyond the horizon."

UMI

The only definition of "under-world" which we know of, that can possibly be appropriated, is not to be found in Webster, but must be borrowed from heathen mythology. Would the Bible Union translators have us attach *this* signification to the term? Yet we can see no way to avoid doing so, especially since they have declined to define the word themselves,[1] and we can find no other definition. We are, therefore, driven to the conclusion that these critics believe that *sheol*, and its Greek equivalent, *hades*, are used in the Scriptures in the sense of *a world* UNDER our own; the abode of the shades, or, if we substitute a popular for a classical term, *the ghosts* of the dead.

The ancients believed that the earth was flat, an immense plain; and supposed (so far as they had any faith whatever in the matter) that the *sheol*, or, *under-world* of their fables was *beneath the earth*. But we know that we live upon a continually revolving sphere; and that *under the earth, above, below, beneath*, with reference to it, are only relative expressions. But, inasmuch as the ancients placed this "under-world" *beneath the earth's surface*, we, if the translation under consideration is reliable, must understand from it that *sheol* is an *inner* world—a locality *within* the crust of the earth. If the rendering "underworld" gives us the mind of the Spirit, we see no escape from the conclusion that the interior of this globe is the abode of disembodied souls during the period between death and the resurrection: not of bad spirits, alone, as the popular geological theory of internal fires might suggest to be the case, but of *all*; for no point can be more clearly demonstrated from the Scriptures than that *all* who die go into *sheol*, whatever or wherever it may be.

This idea of the under-world is very suggestive, and affords wide scope for the powers of the imagination. How do the departed souls make their way to this internal (we had almost said 'infernal') abode? Do they pass through the solid crust? Or are the openings afforded by extinct volcanoes or dried geysers "the gates of *sheol*," celebrated in Hebrew poetry? Or was Symmes' theory a true one, and do the disembodied pass to

[1] Reference is here made to a letter sent to the Union by a responsible person, and a friend and member of the society, asking the translators to tell what they meant by the phrase "under-world." No notice, whatever, was taken of the communication.

glory, or its opposite, *via* the Poles? Or will refuge from these absurdities be found in that greater absurdity, that immaterial spirits may pass from one place to another without traversing the intermediate space?

We may be charged with irreverence. No, we are in serious earnest. If *sheol* is "the *under-world*," as related to that on which we live, *it must be within the globe!* And if that is *not* what it means, then let the scholars tell us what it does mean, in intelligible English, that we may understand them.

But our thanks are due the Bible Union for this; that if they have given us an unintelligible rendering, they have, at least, made it uniform; and wherever the term under consideration occurs, it is rendered *under-world*.[1] This is a decided improvement upon the common version, inasmuch as it enables the English reader to gather all the passages containing the expression, and deduce from a general view of the subject the sense which the translators withhold. In the common version *sheol* is rendered by three words: *hell, grave, pit*. And the sadly incorrect doctrine that sinners enter a place or state of conscious punishment at death, has received no little encouragement from this improperly varied rendering of the word.[2] A uniform translation of *sheol* by either *hell, grave*, or *pit*, would be a sufficient refutation of popular notions concerning the intermediate state.

Who, that has not been informed of the true sense, when reading in David—

> "The wicked shall be turned into *hell*,
> With all the nations that forget God;"

has any doubt that the Psalmist speaks of that same *gehenna* of which Jesus sometimes discourses, and where it is, by many, supposed the damned are to suffer ceaseless wo? But must not their horrible faith give way to doubt when they read in the new version—"The wicked shall turn back to the *under-world!*" and recall to mind that the sorrowing patriarch weeping over

[1] The only exception thus far, is in the 49th Psalm, to which we shall refer hereafter.

[2] Says Prof. Stuart: "In regard to most of the cases in which they have rendered the word *hell*, it may be doubtful whether they meant thereby to designate *the world of future torment*.... The inconstancy with which they have rendered *sheol*, in the same connection, and with the same sense, is a striking circumstance, which cannot but be regarded with some wonder by an attentive inquirer."

Joseph's supposed death by wild beasts, said (Gen. 37 : 35)—"*I* will go down to *my son*, mourning, *to the under-world*." Will it not instantly occur to them, that if the good Joseph went to *the under-world*, and Jacob anticipated entering the same place, *hell* must be a very different region from what they had previously supposed? Whether this discovery should or should not dispel all the mists of an incorrect theology, the reader in the case supposed must begin to suspect that there is a mistake somewhere in his faith concerning the state of the dead.

It is evident that modern translators are perplexed when they come to this word, and its Greek equivalent, *hades*. To render it uniformly *grave*, which all authorities allow is an evident, if not the primary sense, would undermine popular theology. And though some claim for *sheol* the sense of *the spirit world*, this rendering, if uniform, would be equally destructive of theology, involving not only it, but the Bible itself in absurdities of the most intense character. Some, in view of the difficulties, real or supposed, attaching to the etymology of these words, have urged that they be *transferred* instead of translated, as was the case with that bone of contention, *baptizein*. Norton and others have adopted this course. But the action of the Bible Union concerning the word *baptizein*, in insisting upon translation, and the right of the English reader to know the exact sense of the Greek word, made it inconsistent for them to attempt to avoid the difficulties of these terms (*sheol, hades*) by imitating King James' translators. They have given us an expression sufficiently indefinite for theological purposes, and in their *notes* have been careful to contend that the *original* really bears a sense which they dare not give it in their text, as essential to the word itself, or its context, *i. e.*, "the abode of conscious, disembodied spirits."[1]

There is, indeed, a sense which we might attach to this term *under-world*, in which we could receive the translation. *Under* means beneath, and by *world*, we understand the earth. Hence we may derive, *beneath the earth*, in the sense of *below its sur-*

[1] "*The Under-world.* By this term is meant (of course only in figurative conception), the abode of the departed, *the world of spirits.*" And it is added, the expressions concerning it as beneath, down, under the earth, etc., "are intended to accommodate what is said to common apprehension, and not to teach us anything respecting the *locality* of the abode of *departed spirits.*" (Bib. Un. Trans. of Genesis. Note on ch. 37: 35). Is not this a palpable begging of the question?

face. Throwing out as too ridiculous for serious consideration the theories which assert that there is actually, or ever was, a world of spirits within our globe,[1] we inquire, What world lies beneath us? And there can be but one answer. It is the world of the dead. On every hand—

> "They softly lie, and sweetly sleep,
> Low in the ground,"

resting in "the universal grave." Not any one tomb or sepulcher includes this *under-world;* but it is the state of death in general; as when we sing—

> "Thou art gone to *the grave*, but we will not deplore thee,
> Though sorrow and sadness encompass *the tomb*."

But, as Kitto well remarks, "The real question is, What is the meaning which *sheol* bears in the Old Testament, and *hades* in the New." For classical and theological definitions and translations should not be allowed to influence our faith, except in so far as they may agree with and confirm the usage which the Scriptures themselves establish. As it is our purpose to ascertain what this is, let us enter upon a detailed examination of the use of the word *sheol* in the Hebrew Scriptures.

It occurs first in Gen. 37 : 35. On inferring Joseph's death from his bloody garment, Jacob said—"I will go down to my son, mourning, to *sheol*." Immediately follow these significant words: "And his father *wept* for him." And this is our introduction to that sad place, which, as Albert Barnes says, is "'*always* represented as being in or under the ground;" always presented as an object of dread; escape from it always accounted an almost inestimable blessing, except to those whose every earthly hope is cut off, to whom it gives rest. But sad indeed is the life from which *sheol* affords a desirable release.

Prof. Stuart remarks on this passage, that "it is *impossible* to mistake the obvious meaning of *sheol*, here, which is the *grave*, or the state of the dead." There is not a word in the entire narrative to qualify it as the story of an unmitigated calamity, which would be a source of mourning for the patriarch until he, too, should descend to *sheol*. For it is evident that when Jacob said, "I will go down to my son, mourning, to

[1] This has been seriously maintained by otherwise intelligent men, within a few years.

sheol," he did not speak of a comforting hope that he should rejoin his son, at his own death, in a state of conscious existence, but, as asserted above, he had received a stroke of affliction that would prove a source of sorrow until he, too, should be carried to the grave. And this view is confirmed, were confirmation needed, by his references to *sheol* elsewhere.

When his sons would take Benjamin down into Egypt, he protests, lest some fatal accident should happen to him, and they should thus "bring down his grey hairs with sorrow to *the grave*." (Gen. 42 : 38; 44 : 29.) And Joseph's brethren urged to him against Benjamin's detention in Egypt, that it would "bring down [his father's] grey hairs in sorrow to *sheol*." (Gen. 44 : 29.) There is in these passages no relieving sentiment or alleviating expression indicating that entrance to *sheol* would restore him his lost son, and give him the society of his "fathers;" but, rather, a fear that accumulating afflictions would hasten his departure to the land of darkness and forgetfulness. (Job 10 : 21, 22.)

Nevertheless it is asserted that the expression—"*I* will go down to *my* son," implies a continued existence of Joseph in *sheol*. Says Taylor Lewis:[1]

"One thing is clear: it was not a state of not being, if we may use so paradoxical an expression. Jacob was going to his son; he was still his son; there is yet a tie between him and his father; he is still spoken of as a personality. He is still regarded as having a being somehow and somewhere..... The *I* and *my son* are alike personal. In the earliest language where all is hearty, such use of the pronoun could have been no unmeaning figure."

To adopt a phrase from Prof. Bartlett, "the inherent vice" of immaterialism is, that it ever builds upon inferences, and nowhere lays a foundation upon a plain "Thus saith the Lord." Thus Prof. Stuart cannot believe but that Hezekiah had faith in the immortality of the soul, because he cannot conceive that he was "more ignorant than the Egyptians." So Prof. Lewis, asks—"Why should not Jacob have had the idea [of conscious existence in death] as well as those most ancient Egyptians?" The answer is at hand: it was because he knew it was "a false-

[1] Lange, Crit. Com., on Gen. 37: 35.

hood forged by Satan," and used in the deception of our first parents. If we would gather anything of Jacob's opinions from contemporary literature, let us seek for light in inspired records, like the book of Job, and not deduce the faith of a man of God from the dogmas of contemporary heathenism. The oldest inspired Scriptures nowhere plainly assert the immortality of the soul, or its conscious existence apart from the body. They do teach, indeed, a future life, but it is by the resurrection from the dead. But for fear the Egyptians should seem wiser than God's chosen saints, language is strained, logic cracked, and rhetoric poured out in streams to maintain from a few inferential passages the popular dogma, while the Scriptures which plainly deny it, are spiritualized and figured away. We apprehend that those who go down into Egypt for theology will fare no better than those who went there for armies. "Wo to them that go down to Egypt for help..... but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel." (Is. 31 : 1.)

Immaterialism cannot find in all the book of God its own peculiar phrases and terms for the expression of its doctrines, nor is there (as its candid professors admit) in the Scriptures one direct assertion of its tenets. Instead of coming to the Scriptures for a system, it brings to them its system, founded in Eden, preserved in Egypt, cultivated in Greece, and culminating in the Great Apostasy and in Spiritism, and endeavors to substantiate its positions by inferences from a few texts, while ignoring a great many; applying the pronouns, and the nouns, also, that stand for human personalities, now to the body, now to the soul, or the spirit, and again to all three, by no other rule than the demands of a *theological necessity*. We use strong language: the occasion demands plain words. On what other principle than that we have styled *theological necessity*, can immaterialists argue as Prof. Lewis has done in the passage above quoted, for their system. He says the personalities are preserved, Joseph still exists; he "is not in a condition of *not being*:" hence *sheol* is not the grave, a place of the dissolution of being, but is the abode of the conscious spirit. But what is his argument from the use of the personal pronoun worth? Will he lay down what he has said concerning their use in *this*

UMI

connection as a principle to govern their interpretation elsewhere? If he should, he must make the Scriptural testimony concerning the condition of the dead a mass of contradictions; *or else he must give up immaterialism.* We accept the principle, and can do it without breaking down our theology: but for the immaterialist this argument from the use of the personal pronouns, proves too much. It carries the personality into *keber* just as clearly as into *sheol,* and lays it in the dust, just as plainly as its life is returned to God. "And unto Adam he said,..... Dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return." (Gen. 3 : 19.) "There *Aaron* died, and there *he* was buried." (Deut. 10 : 6.) "*Moses* ..... died ..... according to the word of *the Lord* ..... and he buried *him.*" (Deut. 34 : 5, 6.) "If a *man* die, shall *he* live *again?*" (Job 14 : 14.) "*Man* lieth down ..... till the heavens be no more *they* shall not *awake* nor be raised out of *their sleep.*" (Job 14 : 12.)

Will Prof. Lewis tell us why we should regard the pronouns in Gen. 37 : 35 as "personal," any more than in the above passages? May we not say of every one of these, as he has of that passage—"In the earliest language, *where all is hearty, such use of the pronoun could have been no unmeaning figure.*" Hence we conclude that *Adam* returned to *dust;* that *Aaron* and *Moses* were *buried;* that the sleep of death is the *sleep* of the *man;* that if a *man* die *he* shall live *again.* We thank Prof. Lewis for the enunciation of this principle; but how his theology is to stand before it is more than we can see.

Numb. 16 : 30–33.—"If these *die the common death*....But if the Lord make a new thing....and they go down quick [alive] into *sheol*....And *the earth* opened her mouth and swallowed them up....They, and all that appertained to them, went down alive into *sheol.*"

In this passage descent into *sheol* and *death,* are strictly parallel expressions; the one is simply the equivalent of the other. They are not antithetical, but mean the same thing. That "they went down alive into *sheol,*" signifies that according to the prediction of Moses, they died not "the common death," consequent upon well known diseases, or old age, but were cut off by a direct judgment from God. "The earth swallowed *them* up; and according to the principle so clearly enunciated by Prof. Lewis, the pronoun "*them*" includes the *personalities*

of Korah, Dathan, Abiram, and all who adhered to them: the *personalities* went down into the earth. There is an apparent reference to this event in Ps. 55 : 15—

"Desolations are upon them; they shall go down quick [alive] to *sheol.*
For wickedness is in their dwelling, in the midst of them."

Not that wicked men are taken *alive* to the spirit world, while God's saints must *die* to get there; but, as the Psalmist explains (v. 23) destruction overtakes them in the midst of life:

"Thou, O God, wilt bring them down to *the pit of destruction;*
Bloody and and deceitful men shall *not live out half their days.*"

Deut. 32 : 22.—"A fire is kindled in mine anger,
And shall burn to the lowest *sheol;*
And shall consume the earth and her increase,
And set on fire the foundations of the mountains."

Says Prof. Stuart: "The image is a tremendous one,—viz.: that of a fire so intense and dreadful as not only to consume all that is on the surface of the ground, but to burn deep down into the under-world." But this is not all we observe concerning this passage; it *locates sheol,* and indisputably attaches it to this eartn. The conflagration does not extend to a spirit-land in some other sphere, but is on and in *the earth;* and if it is a particular locality, is under its crust, towards the foundations of the mountains. The phrase "lowest *sheol*" is not an exact rendering. The idea is not of a series of *sheols,* one below another, but is expressed in the Bible Union version of Ps. 86 : 13—

"For great is thy mercy toward me [as shown in the fact that]
Thou hast rescued my soul from *sheol beneath.*"

In plain prose, the Psalmist esteemed it a great mercy that he had been saved from death or *the grave.*

1 Sam. 2 : 6.—"Jehovah killeth, and maketh alive;
He bringeth down to *sheol,* and bringeth up."

This is another of those parallelisms of ideas in which Hebrew poetry largely consists. The two clauses of the stanza are equal to the same thing, and equal to each other. "Killeth" and "bringeth down to *sheol,*" as well as "maketh alive and bringeth up," are convertible terms. And if any should still insist on applying the last clause of the sentence to the spirit, let them not forget that it *goes down* and *comes up,* but does not pass away from the earth.

1 Kl. 2 : 6, 9.—"Let not his hoary head go down to *sheol* in peace."....
"His hoary head bring thou down to *sheol.*"

In these passages David charges Solomon concerning the doom of Joab and Shimei, that they should not die a natural death, in peace, old and full of years, but fall before the sword. Here, as in every case where the word occurs, the rendering *the grave* makes exact sense, and is justified by the context and the analogy of Scripture.

It is a received maxim of Biblical criticism, "*Scriptura nerat quod non notat.*" The Scripture denies what it does not affirm. And a late writer justly says, "To depart from this rule would break down every barrier of authority, and ultimately obliterate every distinction between the church and the world." Thus far in our examination we find that Jacob and Joseph, and Dathan, Abiram, and Shimei, *all go to one place:* they all go down into *sheol.* The Scriptures give not a hint that it is a place of consciousness, or that it is divided into apartments, one of bliss for the saints, another of woes for the damned. To assume that it is so, is to beg the question, and, also, to violate the plain law of interpretation cited above.

We will now consider Job's testimony, in what is, perhaps, the oldest writing that has come down to us from antiquity.

Job. 7 : 9. "The cloud consumes away, and is gone;
So he that goeth down to *sheol*, shall not come up."

This belongs to a class of texts, some of which are forced to sustain the theory of the non-resurrection of the wicked. But that there is no resurrection at all can be proved from these passages, as easily as the non-resurrection of a class. The context explains that *the dead* do not return to their houses or places in this life, but are dissolved, and, *humanly speaking*, have forever ceased to exist. Their future life will be a *living again*, not the continuance of the present life in new conditions. (ch. 14 : 14.)

Job 11 : 8. "It [God's wisdom] is high as heaven; what canst thou do?
Deeper than *sheol*: what canst thou know?"

Here the so-called "abode of departed spirits," is set forth as the opposite extreme from heaven. Heaven is the hight above; *sheol* the depth beneath—the opposite of heaven as either a place or a state. How different from the prevailing notion!

Job 14 : 13. "Oh! that thou would'st hide me in *sheol*
——would'st conceal me till thy wrath be past;
Would'st appoint me a set time and remember me."

Ch. 17 : 13–16. "Lo! I wait my abode in *sheol;*
In the darkness I have spread my couch.
I have said to corruption, My father art thou!
To the worm, My mother and my sister!
And where is now my hope?
Yea, my hope, who shall see it?
It will go down to the bars of *sheol*
When there is rest in the dust."

Here *sheol* is represented as a barred prison or dungeon. To suppose that Job expected to go to the place of future punishment, or of punishment in an intermediate state, would be absolutely ridiculous. He can only refer to the prison house of death. And in his note on ch. 14 : 16, Dr. Conant, whether willingly or not, uses the very word he evidently should have used throughout the Scriptures in translating *sheol.* On the expression—Oh! that thou would'st hide me in *sheol*, as related to its context, he says: "This unsparing strictness and severity is a good reason for desiring *the concealment* and *repose* of the *grave.*" Thus common sense asserts itself over theological bias.

Job 21 : 13. "In prosperity they spend their days,
And in a moment go down to *sheol.*"

They die without suffering the pain and anguish of lingering disease.

Job 24 : 19. "Drought and heat bear off [consume] the snow water;
[So]—*sheol* them that sin."

Prof. Stuart thinks that "the consumption of the *body* in the grave is clearly the idea, here, which the writer designs to express." But why say "the body." The text says—"*them* that sin." Does not the pronoun here indicate the *personality* quite as strongly as it does in Gen. 37 : 35? Is it the *bodies* that sin that are consumed? or the persons?

The word rendered *bear off* above, and *consume* in the common version, generally carries the sense of seizing upon or taking away *with violence.* As reservoirs or even streams of snow-water, not sustained by living springs are licked up by the fierce drought and heat of the Arabian desert, so *sheol* at last seizes upon and blots out "them that sin." And the context is suggestive, at least, of the sinner's *final* doom:

UMI

"The womb will forget him,
When the worm feeds sweetly on him;
He will be no more remembered,
And iniquity broken as a tree."

Surely here is no hint that *sheol* is a place of consciousness.

Job 26 : 6. "**Naked is *sheol*** before him,
And destruction hath no covering."[1]

[1] This passage derives a special interest from its context. The preceding verse reads: "The SHADES tremble beneath the waters and their inhabitants."

In his notes on this text, in the Bible Union Version, Dr. Conant insists that R'PHAH-EEM should not be rendered THE DEAD, as it always is in the common version, but the SHADES, i. e., spirits, ghosts, or disembodied souls; because, he says, "the term means that part of man that SURVIVES death." And he complains that the rendering of King James' translators conceals "from the English reader the evidence it furnishes, that the Hebrews had the conception of a form of existence after death. But let us see if the inspired usage will sustain this celebrated Hebraist's assertion.

Ps. 88: 10. "Wilt thou do wonders to the dead?
Or will the *shades* arise and praise thee?"

Why should they not rise up to praise the Lord, if in a conscious condition? But the Psalmist's question implies a negative answer; that they will not praise God because they cannot.

Ps. 115: 17. "The dead praise NOT the Lord:
Neither any that go down into silence."

The two next stanzas confirm our understanding of v. 10.

"Will thy loving kindness be told in the grave?
Thy faithfulness in DESTRUCTION?
Will thy wonders be made known in darkness?
And thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?"

This Psalm is the grievous complaint of one who is in sore affliction, because his life has "drawn near to SHEOL," which is the place of the SHADES. Death is represented as a state of "darkness," "without strength," without consciousness—"the land of forgetfulness." If SHADES here means "disembodied spirits," THEY are in "the land of forgetfulness," for to speak of the unconscious body as passing into a condition of forgetfulness, is irrational.

Prov. 2: 18. "Her house inclineth unto *death*,
And her paths unto the *shades*."

A parallelism, asserting that the harlot's ways lead to untimely death. Thus we read elsewhere:

"Her feet go down to death;
Her steps take hold on *sheol*." (ch. 5: 5.)
"Her house is the way to *sheol*,
Going down to the chambers of death." (ch. 7: 27.)
"He [her victim] knoweth not that the *shades* are there,
That her guests are in the depths of *sheol*." (ch. 9: 18.)

Whether this last passage does or does not refer to the Antediluvian giants (Bp. Patrick, Clarke, Scott, Mede, and others, take this view), who corrupted themselves by fornication, certainly no one will contend that the simple are warned from the lewd woman's house on the ground that it is haunted by ghosts of her victims. The stanza simply sets forth the certain doom of those who turn aside to the strange woman—untimely, unnatural death. To be brought down to the SHADES is the same thing as to be brought down to SHEOL, or the grave. They are parallel expressions. Says Prof. Stuart: "I concede....it is possible to interpret Prov. 5: 5; 9: 18; 23: 14, as designating a death violent and premature, inflicted by the hand of heaven." And his impression that somehow the FUTURE punishment is, also, involved in this doom, is doubtless correct. But while the Professor's faith in the Egyptian theory of a future life, forced him to believe, in spite of "the meaning that lies upon the face of the sacred record," (Future Punishment, p. 153.) that SHEOL is a place of conscious misery, on the other hand, those who accept the Bible theory of future punishment are not thus compelled to do violence to Scripture usage: death in sin involves the second death after judgment, and the loss of eternal life. THIS, and not eternal wo, is the future punishment.

Prov. 21 : 16. "The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding,
Shall remain in the congregation of the *shades*."

This is simply declarative of the omniscience of God. Death and grave hide nothing from him. All things are equally open to his sight.

THE PSALMIST'S VIEWS OF SHEOL.

His first mention of this under-world is in the following expressive parallelism, uttered in prospect of threatening death:

"Return, O Jehovah! deliver my soul:
Save me, for thy mercy's sake,
For in death there is *no remembrance* of thee;
In *sheol* who will give thee thanks?"

He whose mouth was filled with praises, and who adjured his soul never to forget the benefits bestowed by Jehovah, here declares, unequivocally, that if he enters *sheol*, he cannot even remember God, much less offer thanks to him. That which in life and on earth remembers and praises God, in death and *sheol* can do so no more. And whenever he is brought near to *sheol*, the most joyful numbers tell of the Psalmist's gratitude at his escape from its clutches. He recognizes it as a hateful condition, "the land of the enemy."

Ps. 18 : 5. "The bands of *sheol* surrounded me;
The snares of *death* confronted me.
In *my distress* I called upon Jehovah.

Dr. Clark remarks: "This passage intimates that those called REPHAIM are in a state of conscious existence. It is difficult to assign the true meaning of the word [REPHAIM, shades.] in several places where it occurs; but it seems to mean the state of separate spirits....awaiting the judgment of the great day." But we question whether one not already an immaterialist would ever think of deriving an intimation of conscious existence from this passage. The word REMAIN is "nooagh," and is the same used by Job in ch. 3: 13, 17, in speaking of death. "I had been AT REST." "There the weary ARE AT REST." It occurs in Dan. 12: 13: "Thou shalt REST." Is. 57: 2: "They shall REST in their beds." It is only a reiteration in a new form of the sentence of those who wander from or forget God: they shall die. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." "The wicked shall turn back to SHEOL—perish forever."

In Is. 14: 9, we again read of the shades; but no proof of their conscious existence may be drawn from the sublime imagery of this parable; for in it the TREES talk and are conscious as well as the shades; and there are spectral THRONES, as well as shadowy kings and rulers. The true condition of the REPHAIM appears in Is. 26: 14, 29.

"They are dead, they shall not live:
They are *shades*, they shall not rise."

The context explains, that they have been VISITED, DESTROYED, and have PERISHED. And in v. 29, we read "The earth shall cast out the SHADES!" Here again we have located the doctors' spirit-world. The SHADES, they affirm are disembodied, conscious spirits; and the Scriptures declare that THE EARTH shall cast them out at the resurrection. That dead men return to the earth is the unvarying testimony of the Word of God; and if there be a SHADE of man that "survives death," it, too, is in the earth, awaiting the resurrection, to be "cast out." Again we ask—Has our globe chambers of bliss and we within its crust? (The word SHADES occurs in another form eighteen times, and is rendered Giants, Rephaims, or Rephaites.)

UMI

He *delivered* me....
Great deliverance he gives to his king."[1]

Ps. 30 : 3. "Thou hast brought up my soul from *sheol;*
Thou hast kept me alive, that I should not go down to the pit....
Sing praise to Jehovah ye saints....In his favor *is life.*"

Ps. 49 : 15. "God will *redeem my soul* from the power of *sheol,*
For he will *take me.*"

But of the wicked he says, in contrast:

"Like sheep they are laid in *sheol;*
Death shall feed on them;
And the upright shall rule over them in the morning;
And their form shall consume in *sheol* from its dwelling." (v. 14.)[2]

Ps. 86 : 13. "Great is thy mercy toward me;
And thou hast *rescued* my soul from *sheol* beneath."

Ps. 88 : 3. "For my soul is full of troubles;
And my life draws near to *sheol.*
v. 12. Will thy wonders be made known in the darkness?
And thy righteousness in *the land of forgetfulness?*"

Ps. 89 : 48. "What man shall live and not see death?
Shall *deliver* his soul from the grasp of *sheol?*"

Ps. 116 : 3. "The *bands of death* encompassed me,
And the *pangs* of *sheol* came upon me....
Jehovah, I pray, *deliver* my soul.
Gracious is Jehovah and righteous....
For thou hast *rescued* my soul from death."

Ps. 141 : 7. "Our bones are scattered at the mouth of *sheol.*"

We have italicised some portions of the above passage by way of comment. If the reader will take pains to examine the context in each case more fully than we have space to do here, they cannot fail to be impressed that to the Psalmist *sheol* presented nothing that was inviting or desirable. The notion that it was the blest abode, in the Messiah's presence, of conscious spirits, formed no part of his faith: for it is incomprehensible that he should have held such a view, and yet have failed to express it in connection with some of the above passages. *No immaterialist writer has ever discoursed to the same extent upon death, without reference to his hope relating to the disembodied man. If David had been an immaterialist he certainly would have declared his faith.*

As to the wicked, the Psalmist says—"Let them be *silent*

[1] This Psalm is found in 2 Sam. 22. We have omitted reference to it there, to avoid repetition.

[2] In these verses the Bible Union have rendered *sheol* by grave. Why not always? or why not *under-world* here, as elsewhere?

in *sheol*" (Ps. 31 : 17); but immaterialism has made the chambers of death resound with their ceaseless wailing. Again they are "as sheep, laid in *sheol;*" "their form shall consume in *sheol.*" (Ps. 49 : 14. Comp. Job 24 : 19, cited above.) Of another class it is said: "They shall go down *alive* into *sheol:*" that is, be cut off by violent death, perish by "visitation of God," as did Korah's company. (Ps. 55 : 15.) Finally they shall "turn back to *sheol,*" even all that "forget God." (Ps. 9 : 17.) Even thus shall all the enemies of God "perish forever."

The only other passage where *sheol* occurs in the Psalms is in 16 : 10.

"Thou will not leave my soul in *sheol,*
Neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption."

Says Prof. Stuart:

"*i. e.*, thou wilt not leave *me* in the grave, nor suffer thy consecrated Messiah to consume, or be turned to corruption there. In other words, thou wilt raise me from the dead, before the grave exercises the power of corruption over me. So Peter construes this passage in Acts 2 : 24, 32, applying it simply to the resurrection of Christ from the grave. Indeed, no evidence is needed besides the nature of the parallelism in the verse, *inasmuch as the latter member explains the former.* ¶We might ask, also, can the soul of Jesus be supposed to have been in the world of wo, the place of the damned? I know, indeed, that there are some who deduce from this passage the doctrine of purgatory, [also, some who deduce a dogma of an apartmental intermediate state. ED.] into which Christ descended, in order to preach to 'the spirits in prison.' *But there is no foundation in the text for any such deduction.*"

The Professor's criticism is brief, but sensible, and is sustained by the analogy of the entire range of Holy Scripture. With a strong arm he wrests this passage from the immaterialist, and gives it to us. And when Peter declares that the Psalmist spake this "of the *resurrection* of Christ," how say some that he was speaking of the disembodied soul?

Canticles compares the cruelty of jealousy to that of *sheol:* it spares not its victims, and knows no pity. "Jealousy is cruel as *sheol.*" (ch. 8 : 6.) In Habbakuk, *sheol* is personified as a monster, of insatiable appetite; always consuming and never filled. "He enlargeth his desire as *sheol,* is as death, and cannot be satisfied." (ch. 2 : 5.) As Job says: "To the grave is he borne away.....all men will draw after him, as before him, without number." So, also, in Proverbs; "*sheol* and de-

UMI

struction are never full." (ch. 27:20.) It never says "Enough." (ch. 30:16.)

In the fish's belly, in the prospect of apparently certain death, Jonah cried, as out of *sheol*, for *deliverance.* (ch. 2 : 2.) He was, humanly speaking, "as good as dead." Amos declares that *sheol* will afford no refuge to the wicked. Even from thence will God bring them to judgment. (ch. 9 : 2.) While, on the other hand, Hosea rejoices that God's elect shall come forth from *sheol* to their reward (ch. 13 : 14) :

> "I will *ransom* them from the power of *sheol:*
> I will redeem them from death.
> O *sheol*, I will be thy destruction."

Certainly he would not sing of *ransoming* them from "a blest abode," where they are near and like their God, even in his very presence! Yet it is the part of man that goes to *sheol* that is to be *ransomed.*

> Is. 5 : 14. "*Sheol* hath enlarged herself,
> And opened her mouth without measure.
> Their glory and their multitude,
> Their pomp and he that rejoiceth
> Shall descend into it."

Here, again, *sheol* is personified as an enormous monster, with wide-gaping jaws, *devouring* its victims. The idea that those who are swallowed up by it "descend" into an abode of conscious spirits, is utterly inadmissible. In ch. 28 : 15, 18, *sheol* is again personified, and occurs in a parallelism, in which *death* is its corresponding word.

> "We have made a covenant with *death*,
> With *sheol* are we at agreement."

Sheol, and death are here used as synonyms.

Hezekiah, like David, was either ignorant or unbelieving concerning the now popular theory that a man whose body is dead possesses higher intellectual powers than one whose spirit is still cumbered with the "clog of clay." He could see nothing desirable, nor any alleviation, in untimely death. Hear him (Is. 38.) :

> "In the *cutting off of my days*
> I shall go to the gates of *sheol:*
> I am deprived of the residue of my years."

But after he has recovered from the sickness, he says :

"Thou hast in love to *my soul* delivered it from the pit of corruption," or from *sheol.* Do the disembodied *shades* dwell, indeed, in a pit of corruption? Better be unconscious!

> "*Sheol* cannot praise thee,
> Death cannot celebrate thee:
> They that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth.
> *The living, the living, he* shall praise thee,
> As I do this day....
> The Lord was ready to *save* me,
> Therefore will we sing," etc.

The best thing Prof. Stuart can think of to vitiate the force of this testimony that the dead are unconscious, is this remark: "Shall we represent the Hebrews, and a Hebrew monarch enlightened as Hezekiah was, as being more ignorant in respect to futurity than the Egyptians? The people of God, who lived under the light of a revelation, more ignorant than those who were in the midst of Egyptian night?" We might answer, that inasmuch as there was not in all the revelations they had received a single authentic allusion to a state of consciousness in death, it would be doing no discredit to the Hebrews to represent them as disbelieving that figment. They knew of a *future life ;* for "these all died in faith." But it was not in a disembodied state. Concerning this they knew nothing. The only testimony concerning their expectation of life beyond the grave, relates to a resurrection. This is "that blessed hope." (Heb. 11 : 13, 19, 35, 39, 40. Ti. 2 : 11–13. 1 Cor. 15 : 16–20, etc.)

In Is. 57 : 9, *sheol* is introduced to illustrate the depths of the degradation of apostate Israel. "Thou didst debase thyself to *sheol.*" Says Stuart ; "There is a kind of paronomasia here upon the word *sheol* ..... Thou didst prostrate thyself *very low.*"

In Is. 14, and in Ezk. 31 and 32, *sheol* is introduced in majestic parables, in the one case addressed to the King of Babylon, in the other to Egypt. The King of Babylon is put for Babylon itself. Sometimes the king is addressed, sometimes the city.

> "How hath the oppressor ceased! the exactness of gold ceased!....
> The whole earth is at rest, is quiet: they burst forth in a joyful shout.
> Even the fir trees rejoice over thee, the cedars of Lebanon;
> [Saying] Since thou hast fallen no feller hath come up against us!
> *Sheol* from beneath is moved because of thee, to meet thee at thy coming:
> He rouseth up for thee the mighty dead, all the great chiefs of the earth:
> All of them shall escort thee, and shall say unto thee—
> Art thou, too, *become weak as we?* art thou made like unto us?

UMI

Is then thy pride brought down to the grave; the sound of thy sprightly instruments?
Is the vermin *become thy couch*, and *the earth-worm thy covering*?....
Thou shalt be brought down to the grave, to the sides of the pit."

This is the parable. The fall of "the lady of the kingdoms" is announced in it, and never did poet use grander imagery, or more graphically picture an event and its consequences than does Isaiah in thus setting forth the greatness and completeness of Babylon's overthrow. The power of the tyrant is broken, and at once the whole earth feeling the relaxation of the bands of oppression, breaks into a shout of joy. Nature takes up the refrain, and the trees speak the language of men. The unconscious dead are pictured as aroused from their sleep by the terrible shock of the city's overthrow, and they taunt their former oppressor: "Art thou become weak as we? Brought down to the grave: the worms cover thee!"

There is nothing in the parable to prove *sheol* a place of consciousness. To suppose that the prophet refers to disembodied spirits of those kings and rulers who had felt the iron heel of Babylon's oppression, is to mostly destroy the force, and wholly break the unity of his bold imagery. It is not *the living*, but "the mighty dead" who speak. That this is the correct view appears from the interpretation of the parable, which is summed up in these words: "I will also make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water: and *I will sweep it with the besom of destruction*." (v. 23) And wherever *sheol* is used in a figurative sense, we never find the figure derived from the idea of a place where there is preservation of identity and continuation of life, but the very opposite of these—destruction and oblivion. Thus Babylon in the figure goes down to *sheol*. In the interpretation she is "swept with the besom of destruction." History records that the prophecy was literally fulfilled. Parallel with this case is that of Capernaum. "Thou Capernaum," said Jesus, "which art exalted unto heaven, shalt go down to *hades*" (*sheol*,) that is to a state similar to that of a dead man; to the lowest depth. What are the facts? While we know the site of Sodom and Gomorrah, the cities of Gennesareth have utterly disappeared. They are buried in oblivion.[1] It is useless

[1] Since writing the above we have read of some of the recent explorations in Palestine, which seems to indicate that the site of Capernaum has been identified, after years of hitherto fruitless search. A few ruins mark the place.

to say that here *hades* is set over against heaven, to denote an opposite extreme. Whatever force there is in the figure lies in and must be derived from the primary significance of the word. And the doom of Capernaum tells us what death will be to all of us, "if," as Paul says, "there is no resurrection." "Then they who have fallen asleep in Christ are perished."

The parable against Egypt in Ezekiel's prophecy is very similar to that we have been considering.

"In the day when he went down to *sheol* I caused a mourning....
I caused Lebanon to mourn, and all the trees of the field fainted for him.
I made the nations to shake when I cast him down to *sheol*,
With them that descend into *the pit*.
All the trees in Eden....shall be comforted....
They also went down into *sheol* with him unto them that be slain with the sword." (Ezk. 31: 15–17.)
"The strong among the mighty shall speak to him out of the midst of *sheol*:
They are gone down, they lie uncircumcised, *slain* by the sword." (ch. 32: 21.)

Thus in these two parables, the only places where consciousness is assumed to have any existence in *sheol*, we have consciousness also ascribed to other inanimate subjects. And we may as legitimately conclude from *these* passages that trees have emotions and can speak, as that those who people *sheol* are in a condition of conscious existence.

Of Meshech and Tubal, Ezekiel says: "They shall not lie with the mighty..... which are gone down to *sheol, with their weapons of war*: and they have laid their swords under their heads." That *sheol* here means the grave, and alludes to the ancient custom of burying the warrior's arms with him, is indisputable.

We have now examined every passage but one in which the term *sheol* appears. Will *it* afford support to the immaterialist theory? Will it contradict, or require us to modify the opinion of what is the Bible sense of *sheol*, deduced from its usage in sixty-three instances? Let us see.

Eccl. 9: 10 "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in *sheol* whither thou goest."

Immaterialism is not only without a single declarative passage in the whole Book of God upon which to rest for support, but it has to account for numerous passages in which its assertions are flatly contradicted. Its ingenuity in disposing of

these (we had almost said its effrontery) would be amusing, but for the importance and sacred character of the subject. As one reads the comments of those who come to the Bible with the idea that man possesses natural immortality fixed in their minds as one of the fundamental truths of revealed religion, they can hardly resist the impression that in them is fulfilled the words of Isaiah—"The wisdom of their mighty men shall perish, the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid." They "turn things upside down." An able scholar and translator, on the above passage from Ecclesiastes, says:

> "Here he says that in that invisible world to which *the spirits* of men depart at death, where separate from the body, they ARE STILL CONSCIOUS AND ACTIVE, there is no work, device nor knowledge, *by means of which* they can repair the failures and shortcomings of this life."[1]

Is not this "turning things upside down?" What may not be proved from Scripture, if we are at liberty thus to add to or take from it. In immediate connection with the passage quoted, the Preacher declares: "The living know that they shall die; but *the dead* KNOW NOT ANYTHING, neither is there any more a reward for them, for the memory of them is forgotten. *Their love, also, as well as their hatred, and their envy* IS NOW PERISHED; neither have they a portion any more forever in anything which is done under the sun." "Under the sun" is a phrase used repeatedly by the Preacher, referring to the present temporal order of things. On this the immaterialist hinges his interpretation that the oblivion of the dead relates only to *this* world, while in another, the spirit-world, their mental powers are wonderfully increased. But inasmuch as after ransacking the testimony concerning the world of the dead, we find many positive declarations sustaining the sense that lies upon the surface of the Preacher's words, and not one *just* inference that the state of death is a condition of consciousness, we may be pardoned for believing that the wise man meant just what he said, and that there is neither "love, hatred, or envy," nor "work, wisdom, knowledge or device in *sheol*." So the Scriptures testify. So we believe.

We will now produce the testimony of Lexicographers, that

[1] J. M Macdonald. *The Book of Ecclesiastes Explained.* See, also, Lange, Clark Scott, *et. al.*

our readers may see that the word bears the sense we have given it elsewhere than in the Scriptures:

It was the writer's intention to have taken up all the passages where *hades* occurs in the New Testament, but the limits of this article forbid that we do so. They are as follows: Mat. 11: 23; 16: 18; Lk. 10: 15; 16: 23; Acts 2: 27, 31; 1 Cor. 15: 55 (This reading is disputed. The Bible Union reads *death*); Rev. 1: 18; 6: 8; 20: 13, 14. In neither of these passages, unless it be Lk. 16: 23, is there anything to sustain the notion of the conscious intermediate state: and it can no more be proved from the occurrence of this word in the parable in Luke than from its use in that of Isaiah.

SHEOL AND HADES AS DEFINED BY SCHOLARS.

SHEOL, is "the universal grave, or common receptacle of the dead, so-called from its insatiable craving." (Prov. 30: 16; 27: 12. Comp Is. 5: 14; Hab. 2: 5.) Not a particular sepulcher, but the grave in its generic sense.—Parkhurst, *Heb. and Eng. Lex.*, p. 351. Ed. 1762.

The under-world. Lat. *orcus*; Gr. *hades*. "A hollow subterranean place." Derived om the notion of rapacity—asking or demanding. Hence the phrase *orcus rapax* in the Latin.—See Gesenius, *Heb. and Eng. Lex.* pp. 1022, 1023. Am. Ed. 1861.

"The infernal regions, *hades, orcus*, the abode of the dead."—Robinson. *Gr. and Eng. Lex.* (Robinson gives the ideas of the heathen fables, adopted by the Jews and "the Fathers," quite fully.)

"The nether world, the grave, death."—Liddell & Scott. *Gr. and Eng. Lex.*

"The realm of Plato, the infernal regions, the shades below, the abode of the dead, *generally* death."—Donnegan. *Gr. and Eng. Lex.*

"A grave is one particular cavity purposely digged for the interment of a dead person; *sheol* is *a collective name for all the graves*. He that is in the grave is in *sheol*; but he that is in *sheol* may not be in a grave, but in any pit, or in the sea. In short it is the region of the dead; which is figuratively considered as a city or large habitation with gates and bars and many chambers.... *Sheol* was always represented as being *in* or under the earth.—A. Barnes, on Is. 14: 9. Barnes, of course, held to the notion that the inhabitants of *sheol* are conscious, although he says: "It was a land of darkness, an abode of silence and stillness."—On Is. 38: 18.

"*Sheol* means in Hebrew what *orcus rapax* does in Latin, or *insatiable sepulcher* in English. (*Fut. Punishment*, p. 104.) The under world, region of the dead, the grave, the sepulcher, the region of ghosts or departed spirits. (p 105.) The word itself means the region of the dead in general; and it is made particular only by circumstances connected with it. (p. 106.) The meaning of *sheol* which lies upon the face of the sacred record (if I may thus speak) is indeed that of grave, sepulcher, under-world." (p. 153.)—Moses Stuart

Of *hades* he says: "That the Hebrews used the Greek word *hades* so as to correspond in general with their *sheol*, is quite plain.... We can no more agree that *hades*, as used by them, did *in all respects* mean the same as it did among the Greeks, than we can argue in like manner in regard to the use of [other] words. A most important philological consideration, and one, I may add, which is very often overlooked in the partial and party examinations to which the Scriptures are not unfrequently subjected." (p. 186.)

UMI

Prof. Stuart shows that the translators of the Septuagint render *sheol* by *hades* sixty out of sixty-three times the word occurs. Twice they render it by *thanatos*, death: and once *pit*. They also employ *hades* to translate the Hebrew for *pit* (Is. 14:19), *silence* (Ps. 93:17; 113:26), and *death-shade*. (Job 38:18.) These renderings, we think, strengthen our view.

"The word *hades* means literally, *that which is in darkness*. . . . The real question therefore is, what is the meaning which *sheol* bears in the Old Testament, and *hades* in the *New*. A careful examination of the passages in which these words occur will probably lead to the conclusion that they afford no real sanction to the notion of an intermediate place of the kind indicated, but are used by the inspired writers to denote the grave—the resting place of the bodies, both of the righteous and the wicked; and that they are also used to signify *hell*, the abode of miserable spirits. [?] But it would be difficult to produce an instance in which they can be shown to signify the abode of the spirits of just men made perfect, either before or after the resurrection."—Kitto, *Cyc. of Bib. Lit.* art. *Hades*. (We think the candid reader will wonder where Kitto found passages to sustain his second notion of *sheol*—the place of future punishment.)

Barnum's Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, art Hell, says: "It is clear that in many passages of the Old Testament *sheol* can only mean grave. . . . In other passages it seems to involve a notion of punishment; and is therefore rendered hell." And it is well added—"But in many cases this translation misleads the reader." We should say *always* misleads.

Geo. Campbell in his *Prel. Dissertations* says: "*Sheol* signifies the state of the dead in general, without regard to the goodness, or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery. In translating that word the Seventy have almost invariably used *hades*. . . . The state is always represented under those figures which suggest something dreadful, dark and silent, about which the most prying eye and listening ear can acquire no information. *Hades* is well adapted to express this idea. . . . and signifies obscure, hidden, invisible. To this the word *hell* in its primitive signification perfectly corresponded. For, at first, it denoted only what was secret or concealed. . . . I freely acknowledge that by translating *sheol the grave*, the purport of the sentence is often expressed with sufficient clearness."

Says Wakefield: "The universal meaning of *hades* is the state of death." (On Lk. 16:6.)

Says Dr. Radie: *Sheol* and *hades* "do not mean that narrow bed in which one corpse is laid, but in this relation they signify the region of darkness and insensibility in which all corpses repose." (*Bib. Cyclo.* art. *Hades*.)

"The Hebrew ideas respecting *sheol* were of a vague description. Generally speaking the Hebrews regarded the grave as the end of all sentient being and intelligent existence." Wm. Smith. *Ill. Dict. of Bible*. art. *Hell*.

John W. Nevins, author of Biblical Antiquities, published by the American Sunday-school Union, in giving the opinion of the Jews on the Greek word *hades*, says: "It became common, especially in the language of poetry, to employ the imagery of a sepulcher in representing the general condition of the dead. A vast cavern was conceived, stretching abroad with immense extent in the deepest parts of the earth. Continual gloom hung over all its scenery, and the most profound silence reigned on every side. No step of living man had ever descended to its unknown depth, nor had the eye of man ever discovered one of its secrets. It was all wrapt in awful mystery; it was the land of silence; it was the region and shadow of death. Round its sides the forms of the departed men rested, every one in his separate place, and when its powerful gates unfolded it was but to admit some new inhabitant to its dreary mansions, as he came from his state among the living on earth, to mingle with the countless multitude below. This unseen, unknown condition of the dead, was called in the ancient language of the Jews, *sheol*, and in the Greek language, which was used in writing the New Testament, *hades*."

Every one of the authorities cited above admits the definition of *sheol* which we have derived from a consideration of all the passages where it occurs. They all claim, also, that it refers to a world of disembodied spirits. But, as we have seen, the inspired writings never demand or warrant this signification in their use of the term. It is used in that sense by the heathen, and by some uninspired Christian writers; but by "holy men of old, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit," never. With them there was "no work, or device, or knowledge or wisdom in *sheol*."

W. L. H.

IMMANUEL'S LAND.

The dying words of Samuel Rutherford were "Glory, glory dwelleth in Immanuel's Land." The following lines were written upon these words:

The sands of time are sinking,
The dawn of heaven breaks;
The summer morn I've sighed for,
The fair sweet morn awakes!
Dark, dark hath been the midnight,
But dayspring is at hand,
And glory, glory dwelleth
In Immanuel's land!

There the Red Rose of Sharon
Unfolds its hearthstone bloom,
And fills the air of heaven
With ravishing perfume;
Oh! to behold its blossom,
While by its fragrance fanned,
While glory, glory dwelleth
In Immanuel's land!

The King there in his beauty,
Without a veil is seen;
It were a well spent journey,
Though seven deaths lay between.
The Lamb with his fair army,
Doth on Mount Zion stand,
And glory, glory dwelleth
In Immanuel's land!

O, Christ! he is the fountain,
The deep sweet well of love!
The streams on earth I've tasted,
More deep I'll drink above;
There to an ocean fullness,
His mercy doth expand,
And glory, glory dwelleth
In Immanuel's land!

E'en Anworth[1] was not heaven,
E'en preaching was not Christ:
And in my sea-beat prison
My Lord and I held tryst;
And aye my murkiest storm-cloud
Was by a rainbow spanned,
Caught from the glory dwelling
In Immanuel's land.

But that he built a heaven
Of his surpassing love,
A little New Jerusalem,
Like to the one above,
"Lord, take me o'er the water"
Had been my loud demand;
"Take me to love's own country,
Unto Immanuel's land."

But flowers need night's cool darkness,
The moonlight and the dew;
So Christ from one who loved it
His shining oft withdrew;
And then for cause of absence,
My troubled soul I scanned,
But glory, shadeless, shineth
In Immanuel's land.

The little birds at Anworth,
I used to count them blest,
There, beside happier altars
I hope to build my nest;
O'er these there broods no silence,
No graves around them stand,
For glory, deathless dwelleth
In Immanuel's land!

Fair Anworth by the Solway,
To me thou still art dear!
E'en from the verge of heaven
I drop for thee a tear,

[1] Rutherford was minister of the parish of Anworth, Scotland. He was imprisoned nine years on account of his adherence to the principles of the Church of Scotland.

Oh! if one soul from Anworth
Meet me at God's right hand,
My heaven will be two heavens
In Immanuel's land.

I've wrestled on towards heaven,
'Gainst storm, and wind, and tide,
Now, like a weary traveller,
That leaneth on his guide,
Amid the shades of evening,
While sinks life's lingering sand,
I hail the glory dawning
From Immanuel's land.

—*Anon.*

THE PRE-EXISTENCE OF CHRIST.

"All men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father who hath sent him."—John 5: 23.

The question to be considered in this article is, Did Christ exist as a person before his Incarnation?

This is eminently a theological question, and in answering it we shall appeal not to the speculations of philosophy, but to the plain declarations of the Scriptures. Accepting the Bible as the standard authority, we hope to bring to its study a teachable spirit and a grateful heart. The abstractions of philosophy, and the speculations of metaphysics, may answer for the skeptic and the rationalist, but with the devout believer in inspiration, nothing can take the place of the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make him "wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Many vitally important truths are written in the fifth chapter of John's Gospel, one of which is embraced in the passage which stands at the head of this article: "He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father." Our Lord was addressing the Jews who had sought to kill him for healing the impotent man on the Sabbath day, and for saying "that God was his Father, making himself equal with God." Our Savior instead of attempting to allay their hostility by disclaiming Divine rank or power proceeded to say that the Father had committed all judgment unto the Son, *that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father.* That the hour had come when the dead should hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that heard should live; that as the Father had life in himself, so had he given the Son to have life in himself; that they were not to wonder at this, for the hour was coming

in the which all that were in the graves should hear his voice and should come forth, they that had done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that had done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. In these tremendous utterances our Lord certainly claimed for himself Divine prerogatives; therefore all men should honor him, even as they honor the Father who sent him. If *we* would thus honor the Son we must *believe* the record which God hath given of him, and accept as *true* the testimony of the faithful witness, who is emphatically styled the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

The first question properly to be considered in Christology, is that of Christ's pre-existence. The Apostle John begins his Gospel with the announcement that "*In the beginning was the Word,* and the Word was with God. And the Word was God. The same was *in the beginning* with God." "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." In this important passage three things are distinctly stated: (1) In the beginning the Word was with God; (2) the Word was God; and (3) the Word created all things. If there were nothing else to the purpose in the whole of the New Testament, these first three verses of the fourth Gospel in connection with the fourteenth verse would suffice to persuade a believer in Holy Scripture of the truth of Christ's pre-existence and Divinity. Without preface or words of introduction, disdaining the verbiage and formulas of Scholastic philosophy, the apostle John, instead of beginning his narrative at the human birth of our Lord, or at the commencement of his ministry, opens his treatise as it were with a peal of thunder in the sublime announcement, IN THE BEGINNING WAS THE WORD. Thus, before time began, or at a point to which man cannot apply his finite conception of time, there existed the Logos or Word. When as yet the heavens and the earth were not, he *was.* He existed before the creation, for he was the Creator of all things. The personality of the Logos is carefully protected by the language used. The Evangelist speaks of *him,* not of it; of a *person,* not of an attribute. John talks not like one speaking of an Ideal Existence, or of a Divine Energy. He worshipped the Word as the Creator, and

Oh! if one soul from Anworth
Meet me at God's right hand,
My heaven will be two heavens
In Immanuel's land.

I've wrestled on towards heaven,
'Gainst storm, and wind, and tide,
Now, like a weary traveller,
That leaneth on his guide,
Amid the shades of evening,
While sinks life's lingering sand,
I hail the glory dawning
From Immanuel's land.

—*Anon.*

THE PRE-EXISTENCE OF CHRIST.

"All men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father who hath sent him."—John 5: 23.

The question to be considered in this article is, Did Christ exist as a person before his Incarnation?

This is eminently a theological question, and in answering it we shall appeal not to the speculations of philosophy, but to the plain declarations of the Scriptures. Accepting the Bible as the standard authority, we hope to bring to its study a teachable spirit and a grateful heart. The abstractions of philosophy, and the speculations of metaphysics, may answer for the skeptic and the rationalist, but with the devout believer in inspiration, nothing can take the place of the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make him "wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Many vitally important truths are written in the fifth chapter of John's Gospel, one of which is embraced in the passage which stands at the head of this article: "He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father." Our Lord was addressing the Jews who had sought to kill him for healing the impotent man on the Sabbath day, and for saying "that God was his Father, making himself equal with God." Our Savior instead of attempting to allay their hostility by disclaiming Divine rank or power proceeded to say that the Father had committed all judgment unto the Son, *that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father.* That the hour had come when the dead should hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that heard should live; that as the Father had life in himself, so had he given the Son to have life in himself; that they were not to wonder at this, for the hour was coming

in the which all that were in the graves should hear his voice and should come forth, they that had done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that had done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. In these tremendous utterances our Lord certainly claimed for himself Divine prerogatives; therefore all men should honor him, even as they honor the Father who sent him. If *we* would thus honor the Son we must *believe* the record which God hath given of him, and accept as *true* the testimony of the faithful witness, who is emphatically styled the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

The first question properly to be considered in Christology, is that of Christ's pre-existence. The Apostle John begins his Gospel with the announcement that "*In the beginning was the Word,* and the Word was with God. And the Word was God. The same was *in the beginning* with God." "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." In this important passage three things are distinctly stated: (1) In the beginning the Word was with God; (2) the Word was God; and (3) the Word created all things. If there were nothing else to the purpose in the whole of the New Testament, these first three verses of the fourth Gospel in connection with the fourteenth verse would suffice to persuade a believer in Holy Scripture of the truth of Christ's pre-existence and Divinity. Without preface or words of introduction, disdaining the verbiage and formulas of Scholastic philosophy, the apostle John, instead of beginning his narrative at the human birth of our Lord, or at the commencement of his ministry, opens his treatise as it were with a peal of thunder in the sublime announcement, IN THE BEGINNING WAS THE WORD. Thus, before time began, or at a point to which man cannot apply his finite conception of time, there existed the Logos or Word. When as yet the heavens and the earth were not, he *was.* He existed before the creation, for he was the Creator of all things. The personality of the Logos is carefully protected by the language used. The Evangelist speaks of *him,* not of it; of a *person,* not of an attribute. John talks not like one speaking of an Ideal Existence, or of a Divine Energy. He worshipped the Word as the Creator, and

adored him as his Savior. To him the life of Jesus was as the light of heaven. He never seeks to idealize the Master. To his conception, Jesus is above and beyond all idealization. The Word of whom he writes is also the Son, the only begotten Son of God. "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." "God sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him."

We have also in the opening chapter of John's Gospel the testimony of John the Baptist, whom our Lord declares to be a true witness. (Jno. 5 : 32.) "John bore witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spoke, he that cometh after me is preferred before me: *for he was before me.*" The followers of Socinus, who denied the pre-existence of Christ will not allow the obvious teaching of the passage, but paraphrase it thus: "The Christ who is to begin his ministry after me has, by the Divine appointment, been preferred before me, because he is my chief or superior." Thus they explain the clause 'for he was before me' in the sense of superior rank or dignity, instead of *time*. John, however, uses the same word—*protos*—several times in his Gospel to denote priority of time. Examples. "The world hated me *before* it hated you." (Jno. 15 : 18.) "He *first* findeth his own brother Simon." (1 : 41.) "The other disciple did outrun Peter and came *first* to the sepulcher." (20: 4.) The verb in the last clause, 'He *was* before me,' is sufficient to fix the meaning of *protos* as indicating priority of time. Had the Baptist referred to the rank or dignity of Christ as separable from the idea of time, he would not have said 'He *was*,' but 'He *is* before me.'

OUR LORD'S DIRECT TESTIMONY.

Our Lord's discourses, in which he claims to have had a pre-existence in heaven, must carry with them the absolute conviction to every Christian heart of the truthfulness of the great doctrine therein enunciated. To the Jewish Ruler, he said: "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." (Jno. 3 : 13.) When preaching in the great synagogue of Capernaum he used the following significant language: "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that

sent me." (ch. 6 : 38.) "I am the living Bread which came down from heaven." (ch. 6, v. 51.) "The Jews then murmured at him because he said, I am the Bread which came down from heaven. And they said is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven." (ch. 6 : 41, 42.) The Jews objected that they knew his father and mother, and could not therefore understand his claim to a pre-existent life. Instead of attempting to remove the impression which his words had made upon his auditors, our Lord proceeded to re-assert his pre-existence in the same terms as before. (vv. 44–58.) He carried the doctrine into its mysterious consequences. Since he was the Bread of Life which came down from heaven, his flesh was meat indeed, and his blood was drink indeed. They only would have eternal life who should eat this flesh and drink this blood. When many of the disciples murmured at this doctrine as 'a hard saying,' our Lord met their objections by predicting his return to heaven as an event that would justify his allusions to his pre-existence. "What and if ye shall see *the Son of man ascend up* WHERE HE WAS BEFORE." (Jno. 6 : 62.) In what manner are declarations so plain and unequivocal to be avoided? It is said that Socinus and his early disciples, in order to account for these phrases, supposed that Christ, between the time of his birth and entrance upon his ministry, was translated into heaven, and there remained some time, that he might see and hear those things which he was to publish to the world."[1] For such a supposition, however, no warrant of Scripture can be found, and the position is therefore clearly an untenable one. Another hypothesis, and the one generally adopted by modern Socinians is, that our Lord's words do not necessarily imply a literal ascent and descent, but merely that "He alone was admitted to an intimate knowledge of the Divine will, and was commissioned to reveal it to men."[2] But to this it is obvious to reply that if the first of these two opposite phrases of "ascending into heaven," and "coming down from heaven," be explained figuratively to mean becoming acquainted with God's will, the second phrase must signify to become *un*acquainted with the

[1] Watson's *Inst.* Part II. p. 341. [2] Beltham's *Inquiry.*

Divine will. Whatever "*ascending* to heaven" may be supposed to mean, in any figure, *descending* from heaven must mean the opposite. If, therefore, to ASCEND, be to *learn*, to DESCEND, must be to *unlearn*.[1]

Again, if to come down from heaven signifies to bring a Divine commission to teach, is it not passing strange that the expression should never have been used in reference to Moses or David, to John or Paul, or to any other of the inspired writers? So decisive is the passage in John 6 : 62 that even Strauss concedes that the language of Jesus is "in its intrinsic meaning, as well as in that which is reflected on it from other passages, unequivocally significative of actual, not merely of ideal pre-existence."[2]

On another occasion, our Lord in addressing the Jews in the temple, said: "If a man keep *my* saying, he shall never see death." (Jno. 8 : 54.) The Jews thinking that by such an announcement he assumed to be greater than Abraham and the prophets, indignantly asked, "Whom makest thou thyself?" Jesus replied, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad." Abraham had seen the day of Christ by the light of prophecy, and accordingly this statement was a claim on the part of Jesus to be the true Messiah.

The Jews evidently thought that Jesus meant by his 'day' something more than the years of his human life. At least they determined by asking him a question to know whether he claimed to have lived in the days of Abraham. "Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?" Thus by perverting the Master's language, they directly raised the question of pre-existence. Now if our Lord had only claimed to be a human Messiah, he undoubtedly would have most earnestly disclaimed any such inference from his words. He had not said that he had seen Abraham, but that Abraham had seen his day. By the light of prophecy and with the eye of faith Abraham had seen the day of Christ and rejoiced thereat. Abraham had looked forward to Christ as the promised seed in whom all the nations should be blessed. (Gen. 22 : 18; Gal. 3 : 16.) Our Lord's design appears to have

[1] Magee on the Atonement. [2] Leben Jesu, ch. 4, § 65.

been to show that Abraham believed that in due time the Messiah would come, and that to him would the gathering of the nations be, and that as a consequence, he, as the true Messiah, was greater than Abraham. He might, indeed, have replied to the impertinent question of the Jews by assuring them that he meant only that Abraham saw him by the light of prophecy, and that this did not necessarily imply that he was Abraham's contemporary. But in his actual answer he mounted up far beyond Abraham both in rank and time, and more than justified the suspicions of his jealous examiners concerning his real meaning. "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, *Before Abraham was, I am.*"[1] Greek—*Prin Abraam genesthai*, "before Abraham was born, that is, before he had an existence, *ego simi, I am.*" Observe, our Lord does not say "Before Abraham was, I was," but "I am." He claims pre-existence indeed, but he claims more than this. He is the I AM. The speaker was "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." (Heb. 13 : 8.) The phrase "I am," denotes existence merely with no note of beginning or end. "Applied to God it denotes *continued* existence without respect to time, so far as he is concerned..... The manner in which Jesus used it would strikingly suggest the application of the same language to God. The question here was about the pre-existence of Jesus. The objection of the Jews was that he was not fifty years old and could not, therefore, have seen Abraham. Jesus replied to that that he *existed before Abraham*.' The passage corresponds with John's affirmation already noticed, that '*in the beginning was the Word*,' and proves most conclusively the personal pre-existence of Christ.....It may be interesting to notice the Socinian hypothesis by which the plain teaching of this passage is sought to be evaded. The first exposition is, 'That Christ existed before the patriarch Abraham had become, according to the import of his name, the Father of many nations, that is, before the Gentiles were called.' The second is, 'Before Abraham was born, I am he, *i. e.*, the Christ, in the destination and appointment of God."[2]

[1] Meyer in loc.: "Ehe Abraham ward, bin Ich, alter als Abraham's werden ist meine existenz." Erasmus in loc.: "Antequam Abraham nasceretur ego sum."
[2] Barnes, *Notes*, on John 8: 58. [3] Watson's *Inst.*, Part II. p. 248.

UMI

A little attention will serve to show the exceeding absurdity of these expositions. Neither of them claims anything peculiar for Christ, nothing indeed more than his auditors, without arrogance, might have claimed for themselves. The first would make our Lord talk thus irrelevantly: "I solemnly assure you [verily, verily. I say unto you], before Abraham shall have become what his name signifies, the father of many nations, I am. Be not indignant at this answer, nor think I magnify myself, for what I assert of myself is equally true of each of you; for *before Abram be made Abraham, ye are.*" The second would make him say to the Jews: "Do not look thus angrily upon me and contemptuously ask, Hast thou seen Abraham? It is true that Abraham has been dead eighteen centuries, and also true that I am not yet forty years old; but notwithstanding this I repeat it, *Before Abraham was born, I was.* But do not mistake my meaning, I claim only to have existed in the foreknowledge and decree of God. Nor do I elevate myself above humanity by this claim, for each of you likewise thus existed before Abraham was born."[1] It is difficult to understand how such expositions could ever have been received by any Christian, and utterly impossible to account thereby for the exasperation of the Jews. *They* evidently understood him as claiming all the attributes and majesty of the Messiah, and the highest honors of God. The action of the Jews showed in what light they regarded his words. Filled with rage at the blasphemy, as they thought it, of his claiming Divinity for himself, "they took up stones to cast at him, but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by." There is nothing in the text or context of this famous passage that serves to support the Socinian scheme. Observe the force of the expression, "*Before Abraham was, I am,*" or, as Dr. Murdock's translation of the Syriac reads—"*Before Abraham existed, I was.*" Just so surely as he spoke of Abraham as a person, just so surely did he speak of himself as a person; and just as certainly as Abraham had a real existence, just so certainly had Christ a real existence before Abraham was born.

The attention of the reader is next called to the solemn and

[1] Pearson, on the Creed.

significant language in which our Lord addressed his disciples on the eve of his betrayal. "The Father himself loveth you *because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God. I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.*" (Jno. 16; 28.) This language is very explicit and to the point. Just as certainly as the second clause of the last verse quoted, is to be understood literally, just so certainly must the first clause of the same verse be taken in its literal sense; or, as certainly as Jesus now exists personally with the Father, just so certainly did he exist with the Father before he came into the world.

That our Lord's language was neither ambiguous nor obscure is clearly seen from the disciples' reply. They said unto him, "*Lo, now speakest thou plainly,* and speakest no proverb. *Now* are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee: *by this we believe that thou camest forth from God.*" Well would it be if all would have the disciple's implicit faith in the words of the Master, and not seek, as do many, to obscure or destroy his meaning by resolving his words into some figure of speech that will inevitably destroy the sense intended. The language of John 16: 28, literally understood, would forever settle the question of Christ's pre-existence. Few and feeble have been the efforts of Socinian writers to meet the direct and conclusive testimony of this remarkable passage. The disciples acknowledged as clear what had before been obscure, and confessed their belief that he had come from God. In plain language when one speaks of his existence, he is never understood as speaking of an ideal existence, but always and invariably of a real or personal existence. In John 16: 28, our Savior uses what the disciples acknowledge to be plain language, and therefore, the conclusion is inevitable, that the existence which he said he had with the Father was a personal and not merely an ideal existence; or, in other words, that Christ pre-existed as a person, and not as an attribute merely.

In connection with this, and as fixing the sense of the passage beyond successful controversy, the reader is referred to Paul's language in the fourth chapter of his letter to the Ephes-

UMI

ians. Speaking of Christ's glorious ascension after his resurrection—as most expositors allow—the apostle by way of parenthesis exclaims—"Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens that he might fulfill all things." It is here unequivocally declared that the same person—meaning Christ—who ascended above all heavens, was the same Being who first descended into the lower parts of the earth. On no other supposition than that of his pre-existence as the Son of God, does the assertion that he ascended imply that he first descended. As he was exalted, so was he first abased; as he rose rose victorious over death, so was he first placed under its dominion; as he returned *to* his Father, so he first came *from* his Father.

Again, how full of solemn significance is that passage in our Lord's intercessory prayer, in which he asks—"O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was!" (Jno. 17 : 5.) There could hardly be a more distinct declaration of the pre-existence of Christ than this. So far as this great doctrine is concerned, this text ought at once to remove every doubt, silence every cavil, and answer every objection. The Socinians, who deny not only our Lord's Divinity, but his existence before he appeared in the world, make a very weak attempt to evade the obvious teaching of this important passage. Their exposition may be seen in the following paraphrase: "O Father, glorify thou me, with the glory which I had with thee *in thy immutable decree*, before the world was." But it is obvious that our Lord did not ask to be glorified with *predetermined glory*, but with the glory which he had with the Father, before the world was. He had once possessed glory with the Father, but he divested himself of this glory when he took upon himself the nature of man. He desired to be re-invested with heavenly honor and dignity. It seems very unlikely that Jesus in his last solemn prayer with his disciples, should speak of *having enjoyed* blessings with the Father which were only to be given to him *in the future*. It is also clear that since our Lord had glory with the Father before the world was, that he then existed as a person, and not merely as an attribute. His pre-existence was personal, not ideal. It would not only be absurd, but irreverent, to represent the Son of God as asking his heavenly Father to reinvest him with the glory which he had with him as a Divine Attribute, Purpose or Idea.

In fact, so decisive is this passage, so impregnable does it stand against all Socinian assaults, that, as Dr. Harwood very justly observes, "were there no intimation in the whole New Testament of the pre-existence of Christ, this single text would irrefragibly demonstrate and establish it. Our Savior, here in a solemn act of devotion, declares to the Almighty, that he had glory with him before the world was, and fervently supplicates that he would be graciously pleased to reinstate him in his former felicity. The language is plain and clear. Every word has great emphasis: "*Glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* Upon this single text I lay my finger. And if plain words be designedly employed to convey any determinate meaning; if the modes of human speech have any precision, I am convinced that this plain declaration of our Lord, in an act of devotion, exhibits a great and important truth, which can never be subverted or invalidated by any accurate and satisfactory criticism."[1]

PAUL'S CHRISTOLOGY.

There are many passages in the writings of Paul in which the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ is very clearly taught. Two of these we will notice. In the second chapter of his letter to the Philippians, the apostle, in exhorting his readers to practice humility, presents for their imitation the example of Christ, "*who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men*"

The antithesis in this passage is between the expressions 'form of God,' and 'form of servant.' In his pre-existent state Christ was in the form of God; but, when born into the world

[1] Harwood's Socinian Scheme.

he appeared in the form of a servant. Leaving the glory which he enjoyed in the presence of God, "He made himself of no reputation"—Greek, *eautone eknose*, literally, *he emptied himself;* divested himself of the form of God, and took upon himself the form of man.

In another place the apostle Paul speaking of Christ says—"By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; *all things were created by him and for him.* And *he is before all things*, and by him all things consist."[1] In this passage which is paralleled only by the prologue to John's Gospel, Christ is said to have existed before the universe, and to have created it. The language, though grand in expression, and sublime in meaning, is utterly misleading unless it teaches the personal pre-existence of Christ. If Jesus had no pre-existence how did he, though rich, for our sakes become poor? (2 Cor. 8 : 9.) Of what riches did he divest himself? If he had no conscious existence before his incarnation, how could he say, "I proceeded forth and came from God, neither came I of myself, but he sent me." (Jno. 8 : 42.) Observe that the *I*, the *person* speaking, is ever the same, whether in the form of God, or in the form of a servant; whether as the Son of God, or as the Son of man; whether as the Divine Logos, or as Jesus of Nazareth, the personal identity is ever preserved—"Jesus Christ *the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.*"

In the days of Noah he preached by the Spirit to the wicked antediluvians; but this could not have been the case if he was not formerly existent at that time. From the Theophanies and Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, very plausible, if not wholly conclusive arguments, may be found to show that he who was called the Angel of the Lord (Ex. 3 : 2.), the Angel of God's presence (Is. 63 : 9), and the Messenger of the Covenant (Mal. 3 : 1), was none other than the pre-existent Jesus. Micah evidently alludes to Christ where he speaks of him who is "to be Ruler in Israel whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." (Mic. 5 : 2.) Isaiah calls him Emanuel (Is. 7 : 14), and Jeremiah says his name shall be called THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. (Jer. 23 : 6.) Zechariah terms him the Fellow of the Lord of Hosts (Zech. 13 : 7), and Malachi points to him as the Angel of the Covenant, who would suddenly come to his temple. (Mal. 3 : 1.)

[1] Benson, in loc.

The time is fast hastening and cannot be far distant, when the blessed Jesus shall come "to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe in that day."

"Soon *all* shall hail our Jesus' name,
Angels shall prostrate fall;
For him the brightest glory claim,
And crown him Lord of all."

J. H. W.

THE TWO-HORNED BEAST.

BY ELD. JOHN COUCH, CHELSEA, MASS.

"And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon."—Rev. 13: 11.

This symbol has drawn out a great variety of opinions from learned expositors, as to its true interpretation and application. Many have looked upon this variety of opinions as proof that its interpretation is very doubtful and uncertain. This jargon of sentiment has become so great, that many have lost their interest in reading or hearing upon the subject; while others turn away with disgust, accusing those who attempt to explain it, as visionary and fanatical. But as it was given by our heavenly Father for our instruction, we shall not be justified in dismissing it without first giving it a prayerful investigation.

We apprehend that the cause of disagreement upon the explanation of this prophecy has been a disregard of Peter's admonition, that "no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation." God has given an explanation of his symbolic prophecies, and when any man gives another, it is "private," and always produces confusion, and should never be followed. As a symbol can never be applied without first being interpreted, let us carefully inquire after the Bible rules by which we can determine its Scriptural signification. If a sym-

bol is not explained in its context, its explanation should be sought for in some other connection in the Scriptures. The interpretation of a symbol in the Old Testament, is equally applicable to the same symbol in the New. The symbol under consideration has evidently no explanation in the book of Revelation. We must look for it, therefore, elsewhere. But what shall we look for? The same symbol, interpreted. But as there are usually some differences in the expressions referring to the same thing in the Old and New Testaments, we must find a symbol having the same characteristics. This symbol is a two-horned male sheep. Do we find the same in the Old Testament? We do; for a ram having two horns is presented in the eighth chapter of Daniel. There is a little difference of expression in the two cases, but we have in both a male sheep with two horns. We therefore understand that the interpretation given of the two-horned beast in Daniel will explain the same beast in Revelation. If *this interpretation* has no application to the symbol, then it is nowhere found in the Bible, and we are left to the vague conjectures of the human mind.

The beast in Daniel is shown to represent the *kingdom* of Media and Persia; and the two horns the *kings* of Media and Persia; therefore the beast in Revelation must represent a kingdom in which all the facts must exist, designed to be illustrated by *that* beast in *that* kingdom. Media and Persia were originally separate independent kingdoms; each having a royal house out of which came these kings. The horns were explained to represent those royal families, or kings. But as the horns were united in the head of one beast, a union of the two families was represented. That union was produced by the intermarriage of the two families. Cyrus was son of the king of Persia, and son-in-law of the king of Media. In him therefore, the two houses were united, and under him, and his successors, the two kingdoms were consolidated. As those were the facts illustrated by the two-horned beast in Daniel, we must find parallel facts in this case, with all the additional circumstances, explained to exist with this beast in Revelation. This beast is shown to be cotemporaneous with the leopard beast of this chapter, both doing their work at the same time, "in the sight" of each other, one supporting the worship of the other. The leopard beast is explained, by many of our best expositors, as representing Catholicism. We think there can be no doubt of the correctness of their application. It clearly represents it in its political and ecclesiastical departments. This same power is symbolized by the horn having mouth and eyes, in Dan. 7. That horn is shown to mean a kingdom; the mouth and eyes, therefore, must mean something in addition to civil power. This same power

is represented in imagery again in Rev. 17, with the two parts illustrated by the same seven-headed, and ten-horned beast, as in ch. 13, with the additional symbol of a woman. The woman in this case takes the place of the mouth in the horn, of Daniel, and also the mouth of the beast in Revelation. In both cases the mouth is heard to utter blasphemies against God, while the woman is presented with the names of blasphemy upon her. The parallelism in the imagery, in these cases is identical, and must apply to the same power. The proof, therefore, seems to be conclusive, that the leopard beast symbolizes the entire papal power, both civil and ecclesiastical.

If this conclusion be correct, then it will be a violation of all the laws of language and rules of symbolization, to apply the two-horned beast to either the civil or ecclesiastical department of the papal power. The leopard and two-horned beasts are presented as distinct and separate from each other as language can make them, and every word of explanation gives two identities, and not an *intimation* that they are one. We might as well say, that William and John are one man, when William is represented as looking upon John, and John as defending William.

It may be argued by some that two distinct symbols may be used to represent the same thing. That is true; but it would be a false representation to describe them, as in this case, as doing separate work, and that work having reference to each other, as if it was done by different agents. We make this more emphatic, because many expositors have confounded the two beasts, as symbolizing the same power. Their argument rests principally upon testimony in verse twelve. Speaking of the two-horned beast, it is said, "*And* he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed." The argument deducted is this: that the worshippers of the papal beast must worship according to the Roman ritual, and therefore must be within the pale of the Catholic church; and that the two-horned beast must exercise his power to produce that result. This argument seems very conclusive at first, but will not bear criticism, for it proves altogether too much, when applied to the eighth verse: "And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him [leopard beast] whose names are not written in the book of life." Following that criticism, this passage proves that all upon the earth who do not worship according to the Roman ritual, *have* their names written in the book of life. Then Mohammedans, Pagans and Infidels, outside of the Roman church, have their names thus recorded. The position is evidently wrong, for the passages do

not teach such a sentiment. The correct idea expressed in verse eighth, is clearly this, that there are two classes of worshippers upon the earth, one is Christian: the other anti-Christian. The two classes are distinguished from each other by certain principles and acts which characterize their worship. As a *representative* of anti-Christian worshippers, stands the leopard beast. It is governed by the spirit, and all the evil principles which control other false worshippers. The spirit is Satanic, and the worship worldly, and pompous. All classes, therefore, who are governed by that spirit, and worship in that way, worship the beast, or worship as the beast worships. To worship the beast, is not to belong to the Catholic church, for that is being a part of the beast, but it is to pattern after its example and follow the teachings of its spirit, doing as it does, instead of following Christ, and patterning after his spirit and the apostolic example. We think therefore that the two-horned beast is not part of the papal combination; but a distinct anti-Christian association, which patterns very closely after the leopard beast in faith and worship, manifesting a strong sympathy for the leading features of its policy.

This beast, according to the Bible rules of interpretation, must, as we have seen, resemble very strongly in its political aspect the Medo-Persian government. It must first, like that, present two kingdoms, which subsequeatly must be united by intermarriage of the royal families, so as to produce a dual or double government, represented by the two horns. This must take place while the great Roman beast is leading, and controling the anti-Christian world. The Roman or leopard beast arose and took the reins of politico ecclesiastical government, during a period of great theological and political strife. That commotion produced two antagonistic theological parties, each seeking protection in their strife from some strong military arm. The differences over which they contended were so slight that the historian said their theological bridge was sharp as a razor. The two classes were called the Eastern, and Western churches; but subsequently have been generally known as the Roman and Greek churches.

The Roman church obtained civil and military aid first, by which it became the great arbitrating power of the political world, and is symbolized by the leopard beast.

After the Greek Empire at Constantinople had ceased to protect and defend the Roman church, it used its power to exalt and protect the Greek church in the East and North, where it had extended and made many converts to its religion. It also prevailed extensively in Russia, and finally became the national religion of that country.

In A. D. 1449, the Turks took Constantinople, the capital of the Eastern Empire, and the Turkish commander sought to exterminate the Greek royal family by assassination, so that no heir to the throne should remain. The design was accomplished, with one exception. Sophia, a daughter of the Emperor, escaped, and was subsequently carrried to the court of the King of Russia, who, knowing her to be the only heir, by divine right (as he understood it) to the Greek throne, and wishing to secure that right to his own family, arranged for the marriage of the heir of his throne, to this Greek Princess, thus securing in that union the right to both thrones. The plan was executed, and Ivan, the Russian Prince, was married to Sophia, the Greek Princess, in A. D. 1472. (See Pat. Dic. of Dates.) As the Russian kingdom was then too weak to dislodge the Turkish intruders from the Greek capital and empire, they contented themselves to wait till God should give them the opportunity to wrest from their hands, what by divine right belonged to them. The Russian government has been seeking the opportunity to establish its imperial court at Constantinople from that time till the present. Since the union was formed between the two nations by the foreshadowed marriage, the Czars of Russia have claimed the right to stand at the head of the Greek church, as the father of Sophia, and his predecessors, had done at Constantinople. They have claimed the right to exercise ecclesiastical authority, not only over their Russian subjects, but also over all Greek Christians residing upon Greek territory.

To represent the two families united, and the two kingdoms consolidated in the Russian empire, they have chosen for an imperial emblem, an eagle, having two heads, the heads denoting the two nations. Upon each head is a crown, showing that the sovereignty of each royal family is preserved. The two crowns are united by a tie, signifying the union produced by the marriage. Upon the center of this tie, is a large crown, denoting the imperial sovereignty of the two nations united. This is the present national symbol of Russia. Nothing could possibly be more expressive of the leading ideas of the divine symbol, as explained, than is this imperial symbol.

The two horned beast in Daniel, was explained to represent the Medo-Persian Empire, made up of the kingdoms of Media and Persia, united by the intermarriage of the royal families. This two horned beast must represent a parallel in history. The Russian government claims that the empire of Russia is made up of the Greek and Russian kingdoms: the two being united by marriage. A perfect parallel. To show still more perfectly how the Russian government understand their claim to the Greek throne, we refer to the fact, that it gave to Ivan

not teach such a sentiment. The correct idea expressed in verse eighth, is clearly this, that there are two classes of worshippers upon the earth, one is Christian: the other anti-Christian. The two classes are distinguished from each other by certain principles and acts which characterize their worship. As a *representative* of anti-Christian worshippers, stands the leopard beast. It is governed by the spirit, and all the evil principles which control other false worshippers. The spirit is Satanic, and the worship worldly, and pompous. All classes, therefore, who are governed by that spirit, and worship in that way, worship the beast, or worship as the beast worships. To worship the beast, is not to belong to the Catholic church, for that is being a part of the beast, but it is to pattern after its example and follow the teachings of its spirit, doing as it does, instead of following Christ, and patterning after his spirit and the apostolic example. We think therefore that the two-horned beast is not part of the papal combination; but a distinct anti-Christian association, which patterns very closely after the leopard beast in faith and worship, manifesting a strong sympathy for the leading features of its policy.

This beast, according to the Bible rules of interpretation, must, as we have seen, resemble very strongly in its political aspect the Medo-Persian government. It must first, like that, present two kingdoms, which subsequeatly must be united by intermarriage of the royal families, so as to produce a dual or double government, represented by the two horns. This must take place while the great Roman beast is leading, and controling the anti-Christian world. The Roman or leopard beast arose and took the reins of politico ecclesiastical government, during a period of great theological and political strife. That commotion produced two antagonistic theological parties, each seeking protection in their strife from some strong military arm. The differences over which they contended were so slight that the historian said their theological bridge was sharp as a razor. The two classes were called the Eastern, and Western churches; but subsequently have been generally known as the Roman and Greek churches.

The Roman church obtained civil and military aid first, by which it became the great arbitrating power of the political world, and is symbolized by the leopard beast.

After the Greek Empire at Constantinople had ceased to protect and defend the Roman church, it used its power to exalt and protect the Greek church in the East and North, where it had extended and made many converts to its religion. It also prevailed extensively in Russia, and finally became the national religion of that country.

In A. D. 1449, the Turks took Constantinople, the capital of the Eastern Empire, and the Turkish commander sought to exterminate the Greek royal family by assassination, so that no heir to the throne should remain. The design was accomplished, with one exception. Sophia, a daughter of the Emperor, escaped, and was subsequently carrried to the court of the King of Russia, who, knowing her to be the only heir, by divine right (as he understood it) to the Greek throne, and wishing to secure that right to his own family, arranged for the marriage of the heir of his throne, to this Greek Princess, thus securing in that union the right to both thrones. The plan was executed, and Ivan, the Russian Prince, was married to Sophia, the Greek Princess, in A. D. 1472. (See Pat. Dic. of Dates.) As the Russian kingdom was then too weak to dislodge the Turkish intruders from the Greek capital and empire, they contented themselves to wait till God should give them the opportunity to wrest from their hands, what by divine right belonged to them. The Russian government has been seeking the opportunity to establish its imperial court at Constantinople from that time till the present. Since the union was formed between the two nations by the foreshadowed marriage, the Czars of Russia have claimed the right to stand at the head of the Greek church, as the father of Sophia, and his predecessors, had done at Constantinople. They have claimed the right to exercise ecclesiastical authority, not only over their Russian subjects, but also over all Greek Christians residing upon Greek territory.

To represent the two families united, and the two kingdoms consolidated in the Russian empire, they have chosen for an imperial emblem, an eagle, having two heads, the heads denoting the two nations. Upon each head is a crown, showing that the sovereignty of each royal family is preserved. The two crowns are united by a tie, signifying the union produced by the marriage. Upon the center of this tie, is a large crown, denoting the imperial sovereignty of the two nations united. This is the present national symbol of Russia. Nothing could possibly be more expressive of the leading ideas of the divine symbol, as explained, than is this imperial symbol.

The two horned beast in Daniel, was explained to represent the Medo-Persian Empire, made up of the kingdoms of Media and Persia, united by the intermarriage of the royal families. This two horned beast must represent a parallel in history. The Russian government claims that the empire of Russia is made up of the Greek and Russian kingdoms: the two being united by marriage. A perfect parallel. To show still more perfectly how the Russian government understand their claim to the Greek throne, we refer to the fact, that it gave to Ivan

UMI

a successor of Ivan I., the title of Czar, which is the same as Cæsar. That title belonged to the emperors of Rome, and when the capitol of the empire was removed from Rome to Constantinople, the emperors received the same title; therefore, the Russian court claimed, that as they had gained a right to the throne, they had a right also to the title, and so their emperors are called Czars.

The prophet said of this beast, that he "spake as a dragon." It was said of the leopard beast, that the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. The dragonic power was evidently the civil Roman power, which was, at the time it was given to the papal beast, exercised by the Roman emperors at Constantinople. The only government which now claims an inherent right to the power of the Roman Cæsars at Constantinople is the Russian.

To speak like a government, is to make declaration of right to govern, and exercise that right. Russia declares that she has a right to control the Greek empire. As we before said, Russia has for a long time exercised that right in the ecclesiastical department, and is now laboring to seize the reins of civil power at Constantinople, and thus speak like the dragon in the most literal sense.

It was also said of this beast, that "he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him." The beast before him, is the leopard beast, or papal power. The papal government is politico-ecclesiastical, claiming divine rights and prerogatives above, and superior, to all others upon the earth. The Russian government claims to possess, and labors to exercise exactly the same. The two horned beast is represented as doing "great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men." This is most perfectly fulfilled by the Greek church, which professes to bring fire down from heaven in the sight of men; thus establishing the faith of many millions, that it is the true church of Christ.

The prophet also represents the beast as "saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword and did live." The wounded beast, was the seven-headed, or leopard beast, and is the same as is represented in Rev. 17, located at the seven hilled city. It possessed, and exercised, the power of the fourth or Roman kingdom, during the reign of its seven heads. The leopard beast, therefore, represents the supreme arbitrating power of Rome during the 1260 years of papal rule. A change of administration must then be experienced. The image evidently represents the Roman power, between the reign of the papal beast, and the final destruction of that power. The

prophecy very clearly shows that the image, is the *last form* of the Roman power. The prophet says of the two-horned beast, that he should say to *them* "that *they* should make an image to the beast which had the wound by a sword." The two-horned kingdom, must therefore say to other kingdoms, that "they" [the kingdoms in communication] should make an image. What is an image? it is something resembling a reality, but cannot be the reality itself. The image of a man cannot be a man. A beast, in the Scriptures, is shown to *represent* a kingdom, or an empire. An *image* of a beast cannot, therefore, *represent* a kingdom, or an empire, but something that *resembles* one. Then there must be combination, association, professedly to rule or govern, like a kingdom. As the image received "life," and "spake," it must become an active legislative body, in the likeness of a kingly government. It caused that as many as would not worship the image should be killed. This proves that it had power to execute its decrees like a regularly organized government. Again the beast that exercised the power of the fourth or Roman kingdom, was an arbitrating power over kings; the image must, therefore, take the position of arbiter of Roman kings. Has a power arisen which will answer the prediction? We think the Holy Alliance will answer the requirements in every particular. That alliance was formed in 1814, immediately after the seventh, and last head of the papal beast, (the French empire,) was driven out of Rome. It has been a great political power, superior to any upon the earth. It is the arbiter, and dictator of the political world, as much as was Nebuchadnezzar, or Augustus Cæsar. Yet it is not a kingdom, nor an empire, but it does the work, and is like the iron kingdom. Surely it is an image of the Roman beast.

Who originally formed the alliance? England, Austria, Russia, and Prussia. This agrees with the prediction, for "*they*," more than one, "should make an image." The one who invites the others to do this work is the two-horned beast. History calls Alexander I. of Russia, the "god-father of the Holy Alliance." He invited the governments of England, Austria, and Prussia, to unite with him, in forming that alliance. It was fully established in 1815, when, by its congress, it "*reorganized*" *Europe*, establishing empires, and kingdoms, dividing the old Roman territory, Italy, into ten principalities, passing decrees, binding kings, like the Roman Senate. It seems to us that predictions were never more signally, and perfectly fulfilled than these, in the historical facts referred to. God's Word gives utterance to heavenly decrees, clothed with divine authority; no power can break them, no arm can prevent their accomplishment. It may lie hidden in dark corners of the earth, veiled

a successor of Ivan I., the title of Czar, which is the same as Cæsar. That title belonged to the emperors of Rome, and when the capitol of the empire was removed from Rome to Constantinople, the emperors received the same title; therefore, the Russian court claimed, that as they had gained a right to the throne, they had a right also to the title, and so their emperors are called Czars.

The prophet said of this beast, that he "spake as a dragon." It was said of the leopard beast, that the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. The dragonic power was evidently the civil Roman power, which was, at the time it was given to the papal beast, exercised by the Roman emperors at Constantinople. The only government which now claims an inherent right to the power of the Roman Cæsars at Constantinople is the Russian.

To speak like a government, is to make declaration of right to govern, and exercise that right. Russia declares that she has a right to control the Greek empire. As we before said, Russia has for a long time exercised that right in the ecclesiastical department, and is now laboring to seize the reins of civil power at Constantinople, and thus speak like the dragon in the most literal sense.

It was also said of this beast, that "he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him." The beast before him, is the leopard beast, or papal power. The papal government is politico-ecclesiastical, claiming divine rights and prerogatives above, and superior, to all others upon the earth. The Russian government claims to possess, and labors to exercise exactly the same. The two horned beast is represented as doing "great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men." This is most perfectly fulfilled by the Greek church, which professes to bring fire down from heaven in the sight of men; thus establishing the faith of many millions, that it is the true church of Christ.

The prophet also represents the beast as "saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword and did live." The wounded beast, was the seven-headed, or leopard beast, and is the same as is represented in Rev. 17, located at the seven hilled city. It possessed, and exercised, the power of the fourth or Roman kingdom, during the reign of its seven heads. The leopard beast, therefore, represents the supreme arbitrating power of Rome during the 1260 years of papal rule. A change of administration must then be experienced. The image evidently represents the Roman power, between the reign of the papal beast, and the final destruction of that power. The

prophecy very clearly shows that the image, is the *last form* of the Roman power. The prophet says of the two-horned beast, that he should say to *them* "that *they* should make an image to the beast which had the wound by a sword." The two-horned kingdom, must therefore say to other kingdoms, that "they" [the kingdoms in communication] should make an image. What is an image? it is something resembling a reality, but cannot be the reality itself. The image of a man cannot be a man. A beast, in the Scriptures, is shown to *represent* a kingdom, or an empire. An *image* of a beast cannot, therefore, *represent* a kingdom, or an empire, but something that *resembles* one. Then there must be combination, association, professedly to rule or govern, like a kingdom. As the image received "life," and "spake," it must become an active legislative body, in the likeness of a kingly government. It caused that as many as would not worship the image should be killed. This proves that it had power to execute its decrees like a regularly organized government. Again the beast that exercised the power of the fourth or Roman kingdom, was an arbitrating power over kings; the image must, therefore, take the position of arbiter of Roman kings. Has a power arisen which will answer the prediction? We think the Holy Alliance will answer the requirements in every particular. That alliance was formed in 1814, immediately after the seventh, and last head of the papal beast, (the French empire,) was driven out of Rome. It has been a great political power, superior to any upon the earth. It is the arbiter, and dictator of the political world, as much as was Nebuchadnezzar, or Augustus Cæsar. Yet it is not a kingdom, nor an empire, but it does the work, and is like the iron kingdom. Surely it is an image of the Roman beast.

Who originally formed the alliance? England, Austria, Russia, and Prussia. This agrees with the prediction, for "*they*," more than one, "should make an image." The one who invites the others to do this work is the two-horned beast. History calls Alexander I. of Russia, the "god-father of the Holy Alliance." He invited the governments of England, Austria, and Prussia, to unite with him, in forming that alliance. It was fully established in 1815, when, by its congress, it "*reorganized*" *Europe*, establishing empires, and kingdoms, dividing the old Roman territory, Italy, into ten principalities, passing decrees, binding kings, like the Roman Senate. It seems to us that predictions were never more signally, and perfectly fulfilled than these, in the historical facts referred to. God's Word gives utterance to heavenly decrees, clothed with divine authority; no power can break them, no arm can prevent their accomplishment. It may lie hidden in dark corners of the earth, veiled

with tradition, and buried deep beneath superstition, and little known; but its silent authority controls councillors and kings, wheeling the nations to the right, or left, ruling the world and its inhabitants, by its changeless decisions. It tells the story of earth's creation, its fall, and the curse. It measures probationary time, limited to six thousand years. It maps the vicissitudes of human governments, exhibiting the glory of kings, and empires, and presenting the graves of cities and nations. It gives a truthful history of the past, correctly interpreting the great events and wonderful phenomena of the present, and unrolling the vast parchment of the incomprehensible future.

Divine truth is like its Author, infinitely perfect. Perfect in its designs, perfect in its utterances, perfect in its application, and perfect in its accomplishment. The earth's frame may be taken down and "removed like a cottage," but the Word of God is changeless as the throne of Omnipotence. Every utterance of inspiration relating to the past, has been perfectly duplicated in history. Faith, then, plants her feet of credence upon Jehovah's testimony of the future, and views with tearless joy the end of sin, the destruction of death, and him that had the power of it, the returning of Christ, and reliving of the dead, the perfecting of creation, and restoration of the harmonies of the universe.

THE NATURE OF THE SOUL.

BY ANDREW ARMOUR.

In all languages adjectives are formed from substantives by an addition to (or change in the form of) the word. In plain language, the name of a thing, by a slight addition to it, is made to express a quality akin to the original word; thus by adding *al* to the word origin we have *original*, and from person *personal*, from music *musical*, and so on. The meaning of the word is thus *very closely connected* with that of the original word, *natural* means of (or like) nature, and *spiritual* of (or like) spirit.

The word soul has not been thus modified, in the English language: *soul-al* would be a new word, but by the laws of language we could not be at a loss to understand its meaning. But the *Greek* word which is translated 'soul' *has* been thus changed

in that language, and from the noun *psyche* (soul) the adjective *psychikos* is formed, meaning of, or relating to soul. Cutting off the final syllable *os*, the sign of number and case, and translating *psych* soul, it is literally *soul-ic*, the *ic* being used as an affix to many English words, such as magnetic, and metallic.

As this word thus formed from *psyche* is used several times in the New Testament, and as it must mean something the same as the word from which it is formed, and cannot certainly mean something opposite, we may obtain some light on the nature of the soul by observing the manner of its use, and the objects to which it is applied.

In 1 Cor. ch. 15, it is rendered "natural." "It is sown a natural body (*soma psychikon*), it is raised a spiritual body (*soma pneumatikon.*) The body that is buried is a *soul ic* or *soul-al* body. If the soul was in its nature immortal it could not with any propriety be said that the body, dead and buried, is a soul-al, or soul ic, or *soul like* body. Beza renders it *corpus animale*, an animal body; and this, no doubt, is the true rendering.

In James 3: 15, this 'soul adjective' again occurs. It is an epithet between two others, thus, "earthly, sensual, devilish." Sensual is *psychikee*, soul al, rendered "natural" in the margin. Think of the common idea of soul—etherial, pure, and in its nature heavenly, "Jehovah's breath"—then read James, earthly, SOUL-AL, devilish." Alas for human theories!

Jude 19 tells us the last-day mockers should be "sensual, having not the spirit." Sensual is *psychikoi*—soul-al, animal. Verily we must seek for immortality, or like natural brute beasts perish in our own corruption. "Man that is in honor, and understandeth not, is like the beasts that perish." (Ps. 49: 20.)

EDITORIAL.

DOUBTS CONCERNING RELIGION.

All honest doubt is to be respected. We should deeply sympathize with those persons whose very love of truth and reverence for God are connected at times with the most painful doubts. Such persons need our sympathy, not our aversion; our prayers, not our curses. Our Savior did not anathematize Thomas because of the latter's doubt. He loved him still, and showed him "the better way." Unlike their Master, many professing Christians frown upon all who venture to doubt the authority of church or creed. A superstitious and unquestioned acceptance of a traditional creed and an intolerant zeal in defense of it, imply less love for truth, than the honest

doubt of one who means to be entirely sincere and thoroughly honest in a matter so important as that of religious belief. It was a saying of Coleridge that, "One had better have Arnold's doubts, than most men's certainties." Dr. Arnold had in early life suffered much from doubts concerning religion, but having at length emerged from "Doubting Castle," he gained the "King's Highway" that leads to the "Celestial City." Ever after, during his long and useful life, he was the kind friend and wise counselor of all who came to him for religious advice. His early struggles and after success fitted him to be the guide of others. "The boys who were tormented while at school (Rugby) with skeptical doubts, took courage at last to unfold them to him, and were almost startled to find the ready sympathy with which, instead of denouncing them as profane, he entered into their difficulties, and applied his whole mind to assuage them." J. V. H.

McCOSH ON MATERIALISM.

James McCosh, D. D. LLD., President of Princeton College, has been delivering a course of lectures on "Natural Religion and Apologetics," at the Madison-square Presbyterian Church, New York City. The subject of his seventh lecture was "Materialism." Among other things he is reported to have said: "The tendency toward materialism in this country must be met." We are glad to learn that the doctrine of materialism is to be met. We hope it may be fairly met. Hitherto, its opponents have relied chiefly on misrepresentation and blackguardism. Materialism asks only a fair field and no favor. Its onward tendency cannot be checked by raising the mad dog cry of "heresy" and "infidelity." Let it stand or fall according as it is true or false. Prove it false and all good men will unite to oppose it. Establish it as a truth and all good men will sooner or later accept it as such. Whoever furnishes demonstrative proof either of the truthfulness or falsity of materialism performs thereby a valuable service in the cause of truth. Dr. McCosh treats the materialist as a "foeman worthy of his steel." He has for him no gibes, or sneers, or contemptuous expressions. He is in evident good humor, for his allowances and admissions are of the most generous and sweeping kind. He says, by way of beginning, that, "it may be allowed that there is a certain relation between mind and body." This is not a very bold assertion, but what is far better, it is an eminently safe one. No one will deny its truthfulness, or charge its author with extravagance in making it. We may take it for granted, then, that there is a certain relation between mind and body. The question to be determined is, *what is the relation between mind and body?* Is the mind dependent upon the body, or is it not? Dr. McCosh's next "allowance" is rather more generous than his first one, and serves as an admirable proposition from which most important inferences may be fairly drawn. "It may be further allowed," says the President of Princeton College, "that *there is a general correspondence between the size of the cerebral hemispheres and the power of the intellect.*" Why this should be so if the mind or soul be a separate entity, and immaterial, the learned lecturer did not deign

to inform us. If intellectual power be measured by volume of brain; if a large brain be the exponent of great mental power, and a small brain of little mental power, why may we not in the descending scale go a step further and say, *no brain, no mind?* If in this life the mind is entirely dependent upon an active brain for the manifestation of thought or intelligence, what reason have we for supposing that when the brain becomes inactive in death the mind will still exist with all its active powers unimpaired?

Near the close of his lecture, Dr. McCosh concedes the whole question in these words: "I am inclined to admit that without physical force distributed in the brain the mind will not work, as a water-mill will not run without water, and when this force is exhausted the mind is helpless for a time." This admission is as broad as the most zealous materialist could have hoped for. Without an active brain the mind is helpless. It cannot work without it. As the water-mill is useless without water, so is the mind helpless without an active brain.

We do not claim Dr. McCosh as a convert to materialism. But we think his *immaterialism* is *almost* as "gross" as our materialism, and quite as heterodox. J. H. W.

THE "LITTLE" STONE.

By what authority is the adjective "little" prefixed to the word stone, when referring to the symbol of Dan. 2: 34? The record simply says—"Thou sawest....a stone." "Little" stone is one of those deceptive terms which contribute so much to the support of erroneous ideas. The minister says "little" stone; the author writes "little" stone; the hearer and reader generally conclude that "little" stone is the reading of Scripture itself; just as multitudes have heard the term "immortal soul" used so frequently as Scriptural, that they can scarcely find words to express their indignation when they are coolly told that the term nowhere occurs in God's Word. What! deny the presence there of a word to be found hundreds of times! But it is not there; and the ruffled searcher has to own his error, or else take refuge in the standard orthodox mode of begging the question—"The immortality of the soul is assumed rather than asserted in the Scriptures."

But to the multitude who really believe that the expression "immortal soul," or an equivalent, is to be found in the Bible, the effect is the same in moulding their opinions, as though the language were really there; and just so the impression that Daniel records the work of a "*little*" stone, paves the way for interpretations of the vision of the Assyrian king which subvert the consistency, as well as pervert the sense of the Word of God.

The "little" stone! How naturally the expression applies to the "little" company, the remnant of Christ's disciples, who were gathered at Pentecost. "And it became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." How naturally follows the oft-repeated assertion, that this "little" stone then commenced to roll, and has rolled and rolled ever since, gradually abrading the image,

and growing, itself, by accretion, slowly enough to be sure, but ultimately to be fulfilled in the conversion of the world.

Keep the idea of a "*little*" stone before the people, and the mistaken interpretation will be received by them. The term fits the exegesis well enough; but in the *narrative*, in the vision itself, it is entirely incongruous, and appears absurd. Let us read. "Thou, O King, sawest, and behold a GREAT image. This GREAT image....the form thereof was TERRIBLE ....Thou sawest till that a [LITTLE!] stone was cut out without hands, which SMOTE the image upon his feet....and BRAKE THEM IN PIECES!" What, this "great," this "terrible" image, broken as into chaff by a single stroke from a "*little*" stone? Could an interpretation be more absurd?

The Scripture record says nothing of the size of the stone. That is left to be inferred from its work: and inasmuch as it "brake in pieces" at a single stroke (it "*smote* the image;" its work was a stroke, not a slow grinding process) the "great image," we conclude that the stone itself was 'great,' sufficient for the work. If we are to change the Scriptural expression at all, the context requires that we read *boulder*, and reject "*little*" stone as an utterly inadmissable reading.

W. L. H.

THE QUARTERLY.

Shall THE QUARTERLY still be sustained? That it is needed, we do not doubt. But Advent periodicals are multiplying, and although THE QUARTERLY fills a peculiar position, there being no other publication of its class among us, nevertheless, we have directly felt the effect of the establishment of other and ably conducted periodicals, in a diminution of our own subscription list. We do not mention this to complain. If our decrease is the increase of strength in other departments of the common cause, we shall cheerfully submit to a decline or even the fall of our enterprise.

But we do not anticipate this. The coming year, we trust, has a brighter prospect for us, and we shall be fully sustained. We feel that we deserve support. We scan the "Table of Contents" of our first two volumes with something of pride, that it has been our privilege to furnish such a mass of deeply interesting and very valuable matter to our thousands of readers, in a form not easily worn out, like the weekly paper, or broad sheet, but in such shape that it can be handled, lent, passed through the neighborhood, and still be preserved, and ready for years (if need be) of service. Who reads an *old* "*paper*" in these days: but an old magazine, if originally good, mellows with age, and becomes a grateful source of mental refreshment.

Look over our "Table of Contents" of the past two volumes. Good as it is, we hope to improve upon it the coming year. We have articles already in hand, and others promised by some of our best writers. We request a generous support, which we shall faithfully endeavor to deserve.

THE EDITORS.

☞ Several Editorial and other articles are crowded out of this, and laid over to the July number.

TERMS OF THE QUARTERLY.

THE QUARTERLY is issued in July, October, January and April. Each number contains 80 pp. Subscriptions may commence with any number.

Single copy, one year,	$1.00
Five copies " " to one address	4.00
Ten " " " " "	6.00
Single copies,	.30

To ministers, 50c., a volume of four numbers.

Any person sending a new subscriber for the *Advent Times*, for one year, shall be entitled to THE QUARTERLY for 75c.

Any person sending four subscribers to THE QUARTERLY for one year, shall receive a copy for one year, free.

Any person sending five subscribers to the *Times* for one year, shall receive THE QUARTERLY, FREE.

Communications may be addressed to either of the editors, as follows: James H. Whitmore, East Shelby, N. Y; or, Wm. L. Himes, Buchanan, Mich.

All business letters should be addressed to

JOSHUA V. HIMES, Buchanan, Mich.

N. B.—A few copies of Volume I. bound, for sale, at $2 a volume. Unbound, $1.25.

Volume II. bound, $1.50. Unbound, $1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS. VOL. I.

No. 1. JULY, 1869.

An Apology. By Eld. Joshua V. Himes.

Letter from A. A. Phelps; Early corruption of Christian Doctrine; Experience in the "Christian" church; Introduction of Destructionist views among Adventists; Importance of the question overlooked, Re-examination of the subject; Human sympathy—extract from Edwards; The Fathers—the spell broken. pp. 3-11.

Truth and Love. By Samuel Minton, M. A.

Destructionist views no ground for the withdrawal of Christian fellowship. pp. 11-14.

Christianity vs. Churchianity. By Eld. A. A. Phelps.

An age of counterfeits; The true and the nominal church; Christ and the Church not identical; Christian worship and church worship not identical; Worship by proxy; Christian fellowship and church fellowship not identical; Churchianity defined. pp. 14-19.

Paul's "Desire to Depart." By Thomas Davidson.

Assertions and charges are not arguments; the question stated; ANALUSAI defined; Paul's "strait;" the "burning desire;" Is Paul self-consistent? ANALUO—its usage; Christ's language; A reviewer in an awkward position; Paul to the Thessalonians; Peter's language; Did Paul use deceptive or careless language? Who are Sadducees? The time of reward; "This earthly house;" "Absent from the body;" The better way. pp. 19-1.

The Kingdom of God. By L. C. Collins.

The question stated; The only safe principle of interpretation; Facts justify literal interpretation; The kingdom of God literal and with locality; Shadow and substance; The three worlds; The great image; The "stone" kingdom—to us and forever; The stone does not symbolize the gospel; Daniel ch. 7; The kingdom "at hand;" Objections considered—Mat. 16:28; Mk. 9:1; Lk. 17:21; Jno. 18:26; Rom. 14:17; Col. 1:13; The parables illustrative of the kingdom—Mat. 13:33; 13:31, 32; Hope centers in the second advent. pp. 31-49.

An Approaching Change. North British Review. p. 49.

Life and Death. By James H. Whitmore.

The terms defined and illustrated; Panton Ham on the use of the terms; Abp. Whately; Matteson's mistake; Conclusive testimony; Pres. Dwight's admission; Orthodoxy against the Bible; The Life-giver; A magnificent destiny; Destruction of death; Reason of the unpopularity of the doctrine of the Advent. pp. 50-63.

The Signs. (Sel.) By H. Bonar.

Night cometh—the day at hand; The signs notable and numerous; The diffu-

and growing, itself, by accretion, slowly enough to be sure, but ultimately to be fulfilled in the conversion of the world.

Keep the idea of a "*little*" stone before the people, and the mistaken interpretation will be received by them. The term fits the exegesis well enough; but in the *narrative*, in the vision itself, it is entirely incongruous, and appears absurd. Let us read. "Thou, O King, sawest, and behold a GREAT image. This GREAT image....the form thereof was TERRIBLE ....Thou sawest till that a [LITTLE!] stone was cut out without hands, which SMOTE the image upon his feet....and BRAKE THEM IN PIECES!" What, this "great," this "terrible" image, broken as into chaff by a single stroke from a "*little*" stone? Could an interpretation be more absurd?

The Scripture record says nothing of the size of the stone. That is left to be inferred from its work: and inasmuch as it "brake in pieces" at a single stroke (it "*smote* the image;" its work was a stroke, not a slow grinding process) the "great image," we conclude that the stone itself was 'great,' sufficient for the work. If we are to change the Scriptural expression at all, the context requires that we read *boulder*, and reject "*little*" stone as an utterly inadmissable reading.

W. L. H.

THE QUARTERLY.

Shall THE QUARTERLY still be sustained? That it is needed, we do not doubt. But Advent periodicals are multiplying, and although THE QUARTERLY fills a peculiar position, there being no other publication of its class among us, nevertheless, we have directly felt the effect of the establishment of other and ably conducted periodicals, in a diminution of our own subscription list. We do not mention this to complain. If our decrease is the increase of strength in other departments of the common cause, we shall cheerfully submit to a decline or even the fall of our enterprise.

But we do not anticipate this. The coming year, we trust, has a brighter prospect for us, and we shall be fully sustained. We feel that we deserve support. We scan the "Table of Contents" of our first two volumes with something of pride, that it has been our privilege to furnish such a mass of deeply interesting and very valuable matter to our thousands of readers, in a form not easily worn out, like the weekly paper, or broad sheet, but in such shape that it can be handled, lent, passed through the neighborhood, and still be preserved, and ready for years (if need be) of service. Who reads an *old* "*paper*" in these days: but an old magazine, if originally good, mellows with age, and becomes a grateful source of mental refreshment.

Look over our "Table of Contents" of the past two volumes. Good as it is, we hope to improve upon it the coming year. We have articles already in hand, and others promised by some of our best writers. We request a generous support, which we shall faithfully endeavor to deserve.

THE EDITORS.

☞ Several Editorial and other articles are crowded out of this, and laid over to the July number.

TERMS OF THE QUARTERLY.

THE QUARTERLY is issued in July, October, January and April. Each number contains 80 pp. Subscriptions may commence with any number.

Single copy, one year	$1.00
Five copies " " to one address	4.00
Ten " " " " "	6.00
Single copies	.30

To ministers, 50c., a volume of four numbers.

Any person sending a new subscriber for the *Advent Times*, for one year, shall be entitled to THE QUARTERLY for 75c.

Any person sending four subscribers to THE QUARTERLY for one year, shall receive a copy for one year, free.

Any person sending five subscribers to the *Times* for one year, shall receive THE QUARTERLY, FREE.

Communications may be addressed to either of the editors, as follows: James H. Whitmore, East Shelby, N. Y; or, Wm. L. Himes, Buchanan, Mich.

All business letters should be addressed to

JOSHUA V. HIMES, Buchanan, Mich.

N. B.—A few copies of Volume I. bound, for sale, at $2 a volume. Unbound, $1.25.

Volume II. bound, $1.50. Unbound, $1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS. VOL. I.

No. 1. JULY, 1869.

An Apology. By Eld. Joshua V. Himes.

Letter from A. A. Phelps; Early corruption of Christian Doctrine; Experience in the "Christian" church; Introduction of Destructionist views among Adventists; Importance of the question overlooked. Re-examination of the subject; Human sympathy—extract from Edwards; The Fathers—the spell broken. pp. 3-11.

Truth and Love. By Samuel Minton, M. A.

Destructionist views no ground for the withdrawal of Christian fellowship. pp. 11-14.

Christianity *vs.* Churchianity. By Eld. A. A. Phelps.

An age of counterfeits; The true and the nominal church; Christ and the Church not identical; Christian worship and church worship not identical; Worship by proxy; Christian fellowship and church fellowship not identical; Churchianity defined. pp. 14-19.

Paul's "Desire to Depart." By Thomas Davidson.

Assertions and charges are not arguments; the question stated; ANALUSAI defined; Paul's "strait;" the "burning desire;" Is Paul self-consistent? ANALUO—its usage; Christ's language; A reviewer in an awkward position; Paul to the Thessalonians; Peter's language; Did Paul use deceptive or careless language? Who are Sadducees? The time of reward; "This earthly house;" "Absent from the body;" The better way. pp. 19-1.

The Kingdom of God. By L. C. Collins.

The question stated; The only safe principle of interpretation; Facts justify literal interpretation; The kingdom of God literal and with locality; Shadow and substance; The three worlds; The great image; The "stone" kingdom—to us and forever; The stone does not symbolize the gospel; Daniel ch. 7; The kingdom "at hand;" Objections considered—Mat. 16:28; Mk. 9:1; Lk. 17:21; Jno. 18:36; Rom. 14:17; Col. 1:13; The parables illustrative of the kingdom—Mat. 13:33; 13:31, 32; Hope centers in the second advent. pp. 31-49.

An Approaching Change. North British Review. p. 49.

Life and Death. By James H. Whitmore.

The terms defined and illustrated; Panton Ham on the use of the terms; Abp. Whately; Matteson's mistake; Conclusive testimony; Pres. Dwight's admission; Orthodoxy against the Bible; The Life-giver; A magnificent destiny; Destruction of death; Reason of the unpopularity of the doctrine of the Advent. pp. 50-63.

The Signs. (Sel.) By H. Bonar.

Night cometh—the day at hand; The signs notable and numerous; The diffu-

ion of infidelity; Increase of immorality; Prevalence of formalism; Strange mixture of opinions; Wars, rumors of wars, earthquakes, etc.; General restlessness; Missions; Prevalent disbelief; The spread of knowledge; General review of the situation. pp. 64–76.
Editorial.
THE QUARTERLY—its purpose and objects; Our contributors; Dr. Charles K. True on Punishment.

No. 2. OCTOBER, 1869.
The Comforting Hope. By O. R. Fassett, M. D.
The resurrection of Christ the foundation of all hope of a future existence; The dead who are "brought again"—Landis on Bush; Are the souls asleep? Primitive and modern phraseology—the difference between them; Phil. 1: 22, 23; 2 Cor. 5: 2–4; Tradition added to Scripture; Gibbon, Hudson, Tyndall; The hopeless sorrow of the heathen—illustrated by extracts and epitaphs; "Sorrow NOT without hope;" The "Styx" and Jordan; Testimony of the Catacombs of Rome, with quotations; Modern epitaphs; Whately on the intermediate state. pp. 82–106.
First things and first thoughts on Awaking. Anon. pp. 106–114.
Evening by Evening. Poetry. H. Bonar. p. 115
The Trinity. An historical sketch by E. Royce. pp. 116–124.
Has He Come? By Eld. Geo. Thomson.
The coming personal; In the clouds; With angels; Resurrection; Judgment; Time of reward; Enthroned. pp. 125–134.
Missionary Theology. By Rev. Edward White.
The dearth of interest in missions; Skepticism as to the theory on which they are established; Influence of the dogma of endless misery; Its evils clearly stated; Life in Christ and the personal Advent the true missionary doctrines. pp. 132–141.
The Second Advent.
Importance of the topic: Its nature; EPIPHANI.—PAROUSIA; Time of the Advent; Preceding signs; Practical moral bearing of the doctrine. pp. 141–150.
Editorial.
"The Doctrine of Immortality;" How THE QUARTERLY is received; The central truth; The Duke of Argyll on the generation of thought. pp. 159–160.

No. 3. JANUARY, 1870.
The Gospel Preached to Abraham. By Wm. L. Himes.
Judaism defined; Its fundamental error; The Judaizers of Galatia; The Gospel—what it includes; Preached to Abram; The original promises—what they included; Abram's "whereby;" No new reasoning; The fulfillment of the typical promise; The accurate performance of God's words; The promises of eternal things; A popular error; The inheritance—its extent; the consummation. pp. 161–182.
The Blissful Vision. A poem, by J. Albert Libby. p. 183.
The Duration and Nature of Future Punishment. By Henry Constable.
Future punishment certain; Its duration positively endless; Its nature, death or extinction of being; The origin and growth of the torment dogma; Perversions of words; The language of both Testaments; The sense of Greek and Hebrew terms; Paul's willingness to be accursed; The vengeance of eternal fire; Origenism a consequence of Augustinianism—the one common ground of both systems considered; The final extinction of evil. pp. 184–216.
The Saints Joy and Sorrow. (Sel.) pp. 216–218.
The Use and Value of the term "Aion." Abridged from DeQuincy, by Jas. H. Whitmore. pp. 219–222.
The Return of Christ and the Hope of the Early Church. The Rainbow.
The Advent—its paramount importance in the minds of the Apostolic church. pp. 223–229.
Ascension Robes. By Wm. L. Himes.
Rise of the scandal; The true "Ascension Robe;" The "Wedding Garment;" Respectable endorsements of the falsehood; Unjustifiable course of the New Encyclopedia; Its inconsistencies; Orvis and Doesticks; Proof demanded in vain; Not ashamed of our hope. pp. 230–237.
Editorial.
Bible materialism gaining ground; Wm. Miller; Our future rest. pp. 239–240.

No. 4. APRIL, 1870.
Immaterialism. By William Sheldon.
The Bible statement of immortality; The soul; Evil results of immortal-soulism; Catholicism; Mohammedanism; Mormonism; Necromancy; Transmigration; Hero-worship; Indian theology; Spiritism; Universalism; Endless torments; Denial of the resurrection; Denial of the personal Advent; Rewards before judgment; A sky-kingdom; The testimony summed up. pp. 241–264.
The Throne of David. by Eld. Frank Burr.
The covenant with David; Historical record; David's throne restored; All Israel saved. pp. 265–271.
A Review of Prof. Barnett's "Refutation of the Theory of Annihilation." By Rev. Henry Constable.
Tribute to the Professor's ability; The "indispensable" word; Is its use sophistry? Fighting a man of straw; Who ever taught absolute annihilation? A charge refuted; A serious misrepresentation; The real point of difference; A revival of Manichæism; The claims of reason; Primary and secondary meanings; A false law of lingual interpretation; A challenge; Attempt to create prejudice, for a subsequent purpose; The appeal to lexicographers; The argument on judicial grounds—tropes not allowed in the construction of laws; Prof. Bartlett "hoisted with his own petard;" A clear definition fatal to error; Bartlett against the Scriptures; A foul slander against God; Horrible results of the premises laid down. pp. 272–290.

Errors of the Age. (Sel.) Bonar. pp. 291–304.
Hades and Heaven. By James H. Whitmore.
The mutual opposition of immaterialists—Clarke, Scott, Barnes, Bartlett, Watteson, Benson, Edwards, Fitch, J. Wesley; The conservative and radical theories; Each theory eats the other up; What say the Scriptures? The poets not good theologians; Barnes against Paul; Fitch's Spiritism; The dead unconscious. pp. 305–316.
Would Earth Contain its Resurrected Inhabitants? pp. 316–318.
Editorial.
Whedon on "Christian Sadducees;" A defence. pp. 318–320.

TABLE OF CONTENTS. VOL. II.

No. 1. JULY, 1870.
Loss and Gain. By A. A. Phelps, A. M.
What loss did Adam sustain in Eden? When will that loss be regained? Paradise; The favor of God lost; Purity lost; A happy home gone; Dominion lost; Life lost; Adam, himself, without hope; His posterity have hope; All that was lost in the disobedience of Adam to be restored through Christ; The whole earth to become Paradise. pp. 1–18.
The Restitution. By Eld. O. R. Fassett.
Paradise lost; Postdiluvian Migrations; Ruins of ancient lands and cities; The Northwestern settlements; A new continent; Dissatisfaction and unrest; Increased emigration; Earth's destruction; The time of restoration; The change near. pp 19–32.
Object of the Present Dispensation. By Dr. McNeile. p. 32.
The Kingdom of God. By Wm. L. Himes.
The prophetic outline of history; The four successive kingdoms; Perversion of symbolism; The "stone" to destroy, not assimilate; Explanation of the phrase, flesh and blood; The kingdom not of this world; Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other; The kingdom under the whole heaven; The Whitbyan theory overturned; The relatives of Christ before Domitian; A part often taken for the whole. Supposed objections considered, Rom. 14: 7, 1 Cor. 6: 9, 1 Cor. 4: 20, Col. 1: 13, "At hand," The transfiguration, Peter's interpretation, The kingdom within you, The kingdom now nigh at hand. pp. 33–49.
A Question for the Times. (Sel.)
Leaven—does it ever symbolize good? A negative answer, Objections considered, The work of the leaven about complete. pp. 49–56.
The Stumbling Block. By Rev. Samuel Minton.
The dogma of eternal evil the greatest of stumbling stones, Illustrations, The love of God, The removal of the offence, What Christ has done for the race, The dogma unreasonable and impossible to be true. pp. 57–68.
The Witch of Endor. (Sel.) By Prof. Walter Scott.
Saul deceived, Samuel not present at the interview, the truth demonstrated. pp. 67–75.
Editorial.
The name "Christian." Its origin, Proper and improper use.

No. 2. OCTOBER, 1870.
The Time of Reward. By Wm. L. Himes.
The popular belief, Its modifications, Character and object of the judgment, the only consistent theory, Is heaven to be our home, the type of the high priest, Saints and angels, Paul's materialism, Agreement of Christ, prophets and apostles, the Revelator's testimony, the resurrection the time of reward. pp. 81–92.
The Final Punishment. By Rev. Willis Truthliver.
Reasons for writing, Principles of interpretation, Malachi's testimony, Burning up the chaff, Everlasting fire, the worm and fire, "Consume," Soul and body destroyed, Everlasting destruction, Everlasting punishment, Smoke of torment, Whence came the common doctrine? Man a living, not an immortal soul. pp. 93–105.
The Davidic Covenant. By Wm. L. Himes.
The sure mercies of David, the Davidic promises, David's throne overturned, the branch, Messiah's kingdom, the Jews'

error not literalism, the parable of the nobleman, Rev. 1 : 9, the PALINGENESIA and APOCATASTASIS, the glorious reality. pp. 103–116.

Stuart on Future Punishment. By Henry Constable.

Not a work for the times, the republishers unwise, Its force is against Origen a theory, It assumes the point now in dispute, Man made in the image of God, Stuart's admissions, the appeal from Stuart to Stuart, the light of nature, A challenge. pp. 117–125.

The popular Superstition. By Ed. O. R. Fassett.

What is a ghost? the children's discussion, Christian superstition, the Church Hellenized, Scripture necrology, the witch at Endor, Eliphaz' vision, Angels not human spirits, Ghost-stories, Appeal to the Scriptures. pp. 126–147.

Life and Immortality only in Christ. Rainbow. pp. 148–150.

The Principle of Interpretation. By Henry Constable. pp. 150–151.

The Doom of the Unjust. By Henry Constable.

A review of Mr. Pridham, exposing several popular errors upon the subject indicated. pp. 151–162.

Editorial. pp. 163–164.

No. 3. JANUARY, 1871.

Ancient Jewish Knowledge of the Future State. By Edward Falconer Litton.

Their sources of information, the immortality dogma unknown to the Jews, the Law, Division of opinion, Influence of Grecian philosophy, Life and immortality brought to light. pp. 1–9.

Satan's Estimate of Sin. (Sel.) pp. 9–15.

Is the Soul a Separate Entity? By Jas. H. Whitmore.

The subject opened, Mr. Clark's position, the once-in-seven-years-change theory exploded, Intuitions of duality, an assumed absurdity, testimony of consciousness, relations of mind to the body, appeal to the Creator, the phenomena of death, various objections considered—their weakness exposed, Facts vs. Assertion, Qualities of matter not yet fully understood. pp. 15–42.

The Burial of Moses. Poetry. pp. 42–43.

The Scripture Doctrine of a Future Life. By Rev. Wm. Leask.

Our right to question interpretations, God's honor involved, Scripture reveals a future life, it is not by nature, is connected with the resurrection, true progression, the glorious prospect. pp. 44–56.

The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment in its Relations to Ethical Science. By James Wm. Barlow.

We are capable of judging in matters of morals, origin of the faculty, Scripture enjoins its use, the appeal in case of differences of opinion, a misunderstanding corrected, sin by a finite being can not be an infinite offence, the relations of the offering of Christ, Creature responsibility, the necessarian theory, is God vindictive? an illustration, are there few that are saved? Francis' ingenuity in torture, a difficulty removed, importance of correct views, the horrors of the popular dogma not fully appreciated, a strong and just conclusion. pp. 57–79.

Preaching to Spirits in Prison. Biblical Notes and Queries. pp. 79–80.

No. 4. APRIL, 1871.

The Man of Sin. Anon.

Differing interpretations stated, and the Futurist exegesis thoroughly refuted, the man of sin identified in the Papacy. pp. 81–110.

Sheol. By Wm. L. Himes.

Appeal to Scripture usage, Underworld—what does it mean? Is the interior of the globe inhabited? SHEOL defined, Is "theological necessity" a proper rule of interpretation? An examination of every passage in which the term occurs, the conclusion from the investigation, the definitions of scholars, conclusion. pp. 112–133.

Immanuel's Land. Poetry. pp. 133–134.

The Pre-Existence of Christ. By James H. Whitmore.

The question stated, John's testimony, Christ's direct assertions, Insufficiency of Socinian exegesis, Pauline Christology, testimony of the Old Testament. pp. 134–145.

The Two-Horned Beast. By Ed. John Couch.

Varieties of opinion, Reason for these differences, Search of inspired interpretation, The same symbol in the Old Testament, The leopard beast, The Greek Empire, Intermarriage of the Russian emperors with the Cæsars, The "image beast," The Holy Alliance, Conclusion.

The Nature of the Soul. By Andrew Armour.

Editorial.

Doubts concerning Religion, McCosh on Materialism, The Little Stone, Table of Contents.